## IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA FOURTH DISTRICT,

 1525 PALM BEACH LAKES BLVD., WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401
## ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN,

Appellant / Petitioner,

# Appellant's Motion To Supplement Record on Appeal 

v.

TED BERNSTEIN, AS TRUSTEE, ET AL.
Appellee / Respondent(s)

Appellant-Petitioner Eliot I. Bernstein, respectfully says and moves this Court as follows:

1. I am the Appellant-Petitioner herein pro se.
2. I make this motion to Supplement the Record on Appeal under Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure 9.200 and 9.220 to provide Transcripts of Hearings not included in the Record on Appeal prepared and filed by the Palm Beach County Clerk.
3. The Transcripts and Records provided are necessary to provide an understanding to the Court of the issues to be presented on Appeal.
4. The lack of full and complete records and filings from the 4 cases including the existence of "filed" items that were never served upon me and the "cross-over" confusing nature of the Dockets where items of one Case Number then appear in others even with Transcripts has caused delay with a substantial time sorting out the information and said motion is filed in good faith. Also, the court recently changed its entire docketing system and changed various of the docket numbers in the cases and this made checking records especially time consuming.
5. Attached as Exhibit 1 is a list of the Transcripts and the corresponding Transcripts for each case and provided to be supplemented to the Record on Appeal if there are any other requirements to make the transcripts part of the record on appeal please let me know.
6. There are missing transcripts for hearings and I am uncertain if attorneys involved in the case or those that have been removed maintain these records and would move to have all transcripts inserted into the record, as due to the fraud on the court discovered and proven already and fraud by the court alleged, these transcripts provide invaluable records for this Court's review and I have not been provided all transcripts or even the service that was used for them.

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully prayed for an Order supplementing the
Record on Appeal as provided herein and for such other and further relief as to this Court may be just and proper.

Dated: June 20, 2016

/s/Eliot Ivan Bernstein<br>Eliot Ivan Bernstein<br>2753 NW 34th St<br>Boca Raton, FL 33434<br>561-245-8588<br>iviewit@iviewit.tv

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that a copy of the foregoing has been furnished to parties listed on attached Service List by E-mail Electronic Transmission; Court ECF; this 20th day of June, 2016.

/s/ Eliot Ivan Bernstein<br>Eliot Ivan Bernstein<br>2753 NW 34th St.<br>Boca Raton, FL 33434<br>561-245-8588<br>iviewit@iviewit.tv

## SERVICE LIST - CASE NO. SC15-1077 \& LOWER CASES DEFENDANTS, RESPONDENTS, COUNTER DEFENDANTS

| John P. Morrissey, Esq. 330 Clematis Street, Suite 213 West Palm Beach, FL 33401 (561) 833-0766-Telephone (561) 833-0867-Facsimile Email: John P. Morrissey (iohn@jrnoiTisseylaw.com) | Lisa Friedstein <br> 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 <br> lisa@friedsteins.com |
| :---: | :---: |
| Peter M. Feaman, Esq. <br> Peter M. Feaman, P.A. <br> 3695 West Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9 <br> Boynton Beach, FL 33436 <br> (561) 734-5552 -Telephone <br> (561) 734-5554 -Facsimile <br> Email: service@feamanlaw.com: mkoskey@feamanlaw.com | Jill Iantoni 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com |
| Gary R. Shendell, Esq. <br> Kenneth S. Pollock, Esq. <br> Shendell \& Pollock, P.L. <br> 2700 N. Military Trail, <br> Suite 150 <br> Boca Raton, FL 33431 <br> (561)241-2323 - Telephone (561)241- <br> 2330-Facsimile <br> Email: gary@shendellpollock.com <br> ken@shendellpollock.com <br> estella@shendellpollock.com <br> britt@shendellpollock.com <br> grs@shendellpollock.com | Counter Defendant <br> Robert Spallina, Esq. <br> Donald Tescher, Esq. <br> Tescher \& Spallina <br> 925 South Federal Hwy., Suite 500 <br> Boca Raton, Florida 33432 |
| Brian M. O'Connell, Esq. Joielle A. Foglietta, Esq. | Counter Defendant <br> John J. Pankauski, Esq. |


| Ciklin Lubitz Martens \& O'Connell 515 N. Flagler Dr., 20th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401 561-832-5900-Telephone 561-833-4209 - Facsimile Email: boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com; ifoglietta@ciklinlubitz.com; service@ciklinlubitz.com; slobdell@ciklinliibitz.com | Pankauski Law Firm PLLC 120 South Olive Avenue 7th Floor West Palm Beach, FL 33401 courtfilings@pankauskilawfirm.com john@pankauskilawfirm.com |
| :---: | :---: |
| Counter Defendant <br> Mark R. Manceri, Esq., and <br> Mark R. Manceri, P.A., <br> 2929 East Commercial Boulevard <br> Suite 702 <br> Fort Lauderdale, FL 33308 <br> mrmlaw@comcast.net | Counter Defendant <br> Donald Tescher, Esq., <br> Tescher \& Spallina, P.A. <br> Wells Fargo Plaza <br> 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 <br> Boca Raton, Florida 33432 <br> dtescher@tescherspallina.com |
| Theodore Stuart Bernstein 880 Berkeley Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com | Counter Defendant TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A.. <br> Wells Fargo Plaza 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 Boca Raton, Florida 33432 dtescher@tescherspallina.com |
| Theodore Stuart Bernstein Life Insurance Concepts, Inc. 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle Suite 3010 Boca Raton, FL 33487 tbernstein@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com | Counter Defendant Alan B. Rose, Esq. PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS \& WEISS, P.A. <br> 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600 <br> West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 561-355-6991 <br> arose@pm-law.com arose@mrachek-law.com |


| Pamela Beth Simon 950 N. Michigan Avenue Apartment 2603 Chicago, IL 60611 psimon@stpcorp.com | Counter Defendant <br> L. Louis Mrachek, Esq. <br> PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD, ROSE, KONOPKA, THOMAS \& WEISS, P.A. <br> 505 South Flagler Drive, Suite 600 <br> West Palm Beach, Florida 33401 561-355-6991 <br> lmrachek@mrachek-law.com |
| :---: | :---: |
| Jill Iantoni <br> 2101 Magnolia Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 jilliantoni@gmail.com | Counter Defendant <br> Pankauski Law Firm PLLC <br> 120 South Olive Avenue <br> 7th Floor <br> West Palm Beach, FL 33401 |
| Lisa Sue Friedstein 2142 Churchill Lane Highland Park, IL 60035 lisa.friedstein@gmail.com lisa@friedsteins.com | Dennis McNamara <br> Executive Vice President and General Counsel Oppenheimer \& Co. Inc. <br> Corporate Headquarters <br> 125 Broad Street <br> New York, NY 10004 <br> 800-221-5588 <br> Dennis.mcnamara@opco.com info@opco.com |
| Dennis G. Bedley <br> Chairman of the Board, Director and <br> Chief Executive Officer <br> Legacy Bank of Florida <br> Glades Twin Plaza <br> 2300 Glades Road <br> Suite 120 West - Executive Office | Hunt Worth, Esq. <br> President <br> Oppenheimer Trust Company of <br> Delaware <br> 405 Silverside Road <br> Wilmington, DE 19809 <br> 302-792-3500 |


| Boca Raton, FL 33431 info@legacybankfl.com DBedley@LegacyBankFL.com | hunt.worth@opco.com |
| :---: | :---: |
| James Dimon <br> Chairman of the Board and Chief <br> Executive Officer <br> JP Morgan Chase \& CO. <br> 270 Park Ave. New York, NY 100172070 <br> Jamie.dimon@jpmchase.com | Neil Wolfson <br> President \& Chief Executive Officer Wilmington Trust Company 1100 North Market Street Wilmington, DE 19890-0001 nwolfson@wilmingtontrust.com |
| William McCabe Oppenheimer \& Co., Inc. 85 Broad St Fl 25 New York, NY 10004 William.McCabe@opco.com | STP Enterprises, Inc. <br> 303 East Wacker Drive <br> Suite 210 <br> Chicago IL 60601-5210 <br> psimon@stpcorp.com |
| Charles D. Rubin <br> Managing Partner <br> Gutter Chaves Josepher Rubin Forman <br> Fleisher Miller PA <br> Boca Corporate Center <br> 2101 NW Corporate Blvd., Suite 107 <br> Boca Raton, FL 33431-7343 <br> crubin@floridatax.com | Ralph S. Janvey <br> Krage \& Janvey, L.L.P. <br> Federal Court Appointed Receiver Stanford Financial Group 2100 Ross Ave, Dallas, TX 75201 rjanvey@kjllp.com |
| Kimberly Moran <br> Tescher \& Spallina, P.A. <br> Wells Fargo Plaza <br> 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 <br> Boca Raton, Florida 33432 <br> kmoran@tescherspallina.com | Lindsay Baxley aka Lindsay Giles Life Insurance Concepts 950 Peninsula Corporate Circle Suite 3010 Boca Raton, FL 33487 lindsay@lifeinsuranceconcepts.com |
| Gerald R. Lewin CBIZ MHM, LLC | CBIZ MHM, LLC General Counsel |


| 1675 N Military Trail Fifth Floor Boca Raton, FL 33486 | 6480 Rockside Woods Blvd. South Suite 330 <br> Cleveland, OH 44131 <br> ATTN: General Counsel generalcounsel@cbiz.com (216)447-9000 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Albert Gortz, Esq. <br> Proskauer Rose LLP <br> One Boca Place 2255 Glades Road <br> Suite 421 Atrium <br> Boca Raton, FL 33431-7360 <br> agortz@proskauer.com | Heritage Union Life Insurance <br> Company <br> A member of WiltonRe Group of Companies <br> 187 Danbury Road <br> Wilton, CT 06897 <br> cstroup@wiltonre.com |
| Estate of Simon Bernstein Brian M O'Connell Pa 515 N Flagler Drive West Palm Beach, FL 33401 boconnell@ciklinlubitz.com | Counter Defendant <br> Steven Lessne, Esq. <br> Gray Robinson, PA <br> 225 NE Mizner Blvd \#500 <br> Boca Raton, FL 33432 <br> steven.lessne@gray-robinson.com |
| Byrd F. "Biff" Marshall, Jr. <br> President \& Managing Director <br> Gray Robinson, PA <br> 225 NE Mizner Blvd \#500 <br> Boca Raton, FL 33432 <br> biff.marshall@gray-robinson.com | Steven A. Lessne, Esq. Gunster, Yoakley \& Stewart, P.A. 777 South Flagler Drive, Suite 500 East <br> West Palm Beach, FL 33401 <br> Telephone: (561) 650-0545 <br> Facsimile: (561) 655-5677 <br> E-Mail Designations: slessne@gunster.com jhoppel@gunster.com eservice@gunster.com |
| T\&S Registered Agents, LLC Wells Fargo Plaza | David Lanciotti <br> Executive VP and General Counsel |


| 925 South Federal Hwy Suite 500 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Boca Raton, Florida 33432 |  |
| dtescher@tescherspallina.com | LaSalle National Trust NA |
|  | CHICAGO TITLE LAND TRUST |
| COMPANY, as Successor |  |
| 10 South LaSalle Street |  |
| Suite 2750 |  |
| Chicago, IL 60603 |  |
| David.Lanciott@ctt.com |  |

## EXHIBIT 1 - SUPPLEMENTAL RECORDS - TRANSCRIPTS

| Supp \# | Hearing In | Hearing Trans <br> cipt <br> Date  | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Shirley Estate | 9/13/2013 Yes | Jessica <br> Thibault/Spallina <br> Tescher | Emergency Motion to Freeze Estates... | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20130913\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20Emergency\%20 Hearing\%20Colin\%20Spallina\%20Tescher\%20Ted \%20Manceri\%20ELIOT\%20COMMENTS.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20130913\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20Emergency\%20Hearing\%20Colin\%20Sp allina\%20Tescher\%20Ted\%20Manceri\%2 OELIOT\%20COMMENTS.pdf |  |
| 2 | Shirley Estate | 10/28/2013 Yes | Michael Todd Berkowitz | Evidentiary Hearing - Moran Fraudulent Docs | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20131028\%2OEvidentiary\%20Hearing\%2OTRAN SCRIPT\%20Shirley\%20Estate.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20131028\%20Evidentiary\% 2 OHearing\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20Shirley\%2 Estate.pdf |  |
| 3 | Shirley Estate | 11/19/2013 No | /Brandan Pratt | Motion to Withdraw As Counsel filed by Huth \& Pratt, counsel for Eliot Bernstein, | No Transcript - Brandan Pratt Ordered Hearing | No Transcript - Brandan Pratt Ordered Hearing | Order is not signed or dated in hand but stamped and not sure if there was hearing??? |
| 4 | Shirley Estate | 1/2/2014 Yes | Erica Field, EMPIRE (954) 2411010/Manceri for Tescher Spallina | Motion to Consolidate | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140102\%20Colin\%20Hearing\%20to\%20Cons olidate\%20Cases\%20with\%20Colin\%20Hearing\%2 OFrenchs\%20hearing\%20in\%20violation\%20of\%20 Statute.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle \%20Estate/20140102\%20Colin\%20Heari ng\%20to\%20Consolidate\%20Cases\%20wi th\%20Colin\%20Hearing\%20Frenchs\%20h earing\%20in\%20violation\%20of\%20Statuf | Manceri claims in hearing that Colin called his office and had him schedule this |
| 5 | Shirley Estate | 1/2/2014 No | Erica Field, EMPIRE (954) 2411010/Manceri for Tescher Spallina | Motion to Consolidate | No Transcript but transcribed | No Transcript but transcribed |  |
| 6 | Shirley Estate | 1/23/2014 No | /Manceri for Tescher Spallina | MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD for Ted Bernstein, 01/23/14 AT 8:45 A.M. F/B: MARK R MANCERI E-FILED | No Transcript - Manceri Tescher Spallina Ordered Hearing | No Transcript - Manceri Tescher Spallina Ordered Hearing |  |
| 7 | Shirley Estate | 2/18/2014 Yes | Lorraine Wofford Pleasonton/Spallina | PETITION FOR RESIGNATION AND DISCHARGE (copy attached) FILED BY: Robert L. Spallina, Esq. | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140218\%20Hearing\%20Bernstein\%20\%202\%2018\%2014\%20hearing\%20transcript.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle <br> y\%20Estate/20140218\%20Hearing\%20Be <br> rnstein\%20- <br> $\% 202 \% 2018 \% 2014 \% 20 h e a r i n g \% 20$ transc <br> ript | Appears in Shirley Docket But Transcript Under Simon Estate Hearing not Shirley Estate. Docket \#90 |
| 8 | Shirley Estate | 2/19/2014 Yes | David <br> Marsaa/Pleasonton | Continued hearing from 2/18 | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140219\%20Hearing\%20Bernstein\%20\%202\%2019\%2014\%20hearing\%20transcript.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle <br> y\%20Estate/20140219\%20Hearing\%20Be <br> rnstein\%20- <br> $\% 202 \% 2019 \% 2014 \% 20$ hearing\%20trans |  |
| 9 | Shirley Estate | 6/12/2014 Yes | David Marsaa Pleasonton/Rose | Hearing re TED MOTION INSTRUCTIONS. MOTION COMPEL ELIOT COMPLY DISCOVERY REQUESTS, RULE 1.285//Curator 2nd Petition for Payment of Curator's Fees/Morrissey Hearing at Judge Colin's Request TED S. BERNSTEIN'S MOTION TO COMPEL Hearing re TED MOTION INSTRUCTIONS. MOTION COMPEL ELIOT COMPLY DISCOVERY REQUESTS, RULE 1.285//Curator 2nd Petition for Payment of Curator's Fees/Morrissey Hearing at Judge Colin's Request TED S. BERNSTEIN'S MOTION TO COMPEL | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140612\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20Colin\% 20Simon\%20Estate.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140612\%20Hearing\%20Tr anscript\%20Colin\%20Simon\%20Estate.pd f |  |
| 10 | Shirley Estate | 6/12/2014 Yes | /Morrissey |  | Yes but in Simon Bernstein case | Yes but in Simon Bernstein case | Appears in Shirley Docket But Transcript Under Simon Estate Hearing not Shirley Estate. Docket \#98 |
| 11 | Shirley Estate | 6/19/2014 Yes | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | JUDGE: Honorable Martin Colin MATTER TO BE HEARD: TED S. bernstein's OMnibus motion including to continue july 11Th HEARING AND SET STATUS CONFERENCE FOR JULY 11TH AND FOR OTHER RELIEF | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140619\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- <br> \%20HEARING\%20-\%206-19-14.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle $\mathrm{y} \% 20$ Estate/20140619\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%20HEARING\%20-\%206-19-14.pdf |  |


| Hearing In | Hearing Date | Trans cipt | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shirley Trust | 9/3/2014 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | NOTICE OF HEARING on Alan Rose Construction of Trust to fix past Fraudulent Conversions and change bene's of irrevocable trust | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 9/15/2014 |  | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | MATTER TO BE HEARD: TED S. BERNSTEIN'S MOTION TO SEVER AND STAY COUNTERCLAIM PENDING RESOLUTION OF TRUST CONSTRUCTION COUNTS / Eliot Contempt | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta <br> te/20140915\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- <br> \%20HEARING\%20-\%209-15-14\%20- <br> \%20Mot\%20Hold\%20Eliot\%20in\%20Contempt\%2 <br> 0\&\%200thers.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140915\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%20HEARING\%20-\%209-15-14\%20\%20Mot\%20Hold\%20Eliot\%20in\%20Cont empt\%20\&\%200thers.pdf |  |
| Shirley Estate | 11/14/2014 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | ESTATE OF SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN - TED S. BERNSTEIN'S PETITION TO RECLOSE ESTATE BASED UPON PRIOR SIGNED WAIVERS AND FOR DISCHARGE OF SUCCESSOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 12/3/2014 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT WITH NOTICE AGAINST PAM SIMON; LISA FRIEDSTEIN INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEE; MAX FRIEDSTEIN; AND JILL IANTONI, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS TRUSTEE -and- <br> TED S. BERNSTEIN'S MOTION TO SET TRIAL ON COUNT II OF AMENDED COMPLAINT | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 1/13/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | SHIRLEY TRUST TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S PETITION TO REMOVE TED S. BERNSTEIN AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE OF the shirley bernstein trust, motion to strike and motion to STAY PROCEEDINGS | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 1/27/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S PETITION TO remove ted s. bernstein as successor trustee of the shirley bernstein trust, motion to strike and motion to stay PROCEEDINGS | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 3/25/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | HEARING COLIN - NOT SET WITH PROPER NOTICE - MOTION TO APPROVE TRUST PROPERTY AND FOR ORDER PROHIBITING interference with closing, including discharging lis pendens CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 3/26/2015 |  | April Segui US Legal Support/Rose, Ted Bernstein | SPECIAL HEARING - MATTER(S) TO BE HEARD: EVIDENTIARY HEARING on Motion to approve sale of trust property and for order PROHIBITING INTERFERENCE WITH CLOSING, INCLUDING DISCHARGING LIS PENDENS | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20150326\%20HEARING\%2OTRANSCRIPT\%2OH OME\%20SALE.pdf | http:///iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150326\%20HEARING\%2OT RANSCRIPT\%20HOME\%20SALE.pdf |  |
| Shirley Trust | 4/23/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | IMOTION TO DISMISS ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S PETITION REMOVE TED bernstein, As successor trustee of simon l. bernstein AMENDED \& RESTATED TRUST / MOTION TO HOLD ELIOT BERNSTEIN IN CONTEMPT OF COURT \& FOR SANCTIONS / MOTION TO STOP SALE OF 7020 LIONS | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | Note Simon Matter being heard in Shirley. Audio says April 22 |


| Hearing In | Hearing Date | Trans cipt | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shirley Trust | 4/23/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | 2nd part MOTION TO DISMISS ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S PETITION TO remove ted s. bernstein, as successor trustee of the simon l. bernstein amended and restated trust motion to hold eliot BERNSTEIN IN CONTEMPT OF COURT AND FOR SANCTIONS | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 5/6/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | MATTER(S) TO BE HEARD: CONTINUED EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO APPROVE SALE OF TRUST ASSET EVIDENTIARY hearing on eliot bernstein's motion to stop sale of 7020 LIONS HEAD LANE PROPERTY EVIDENTIARY HEARING ON TRUSTEE'S SUPPLEMENT TO MOTION TO APPROVE SALE OF TRUST PROPERTY RE: CLOSING AND TITLE ISSUES FOR SHIRLEY'S HOMESTEAD | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Trust | 5/6/2015 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | COURT HEARING for evidence of market value and title company to appear in Shirley Trust case | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| Shirley Estate | 6/4/2015 |  | /O'Connell | PETITION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO MOVE, STORE, AND SELL THE TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7020 LIONS HEAD LANE PETITION FOR INSTRUCTIONS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ESTATE Should make a Loan to eliot bernstein and for other rellef PETITION FOR INSTRUCTIONS AND REVIEW OF COMPENSATION OF ACCOUNTANTS' FEES \& COSTS <br> PETITION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES and expenses for the personal representative of the estate OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN FOR NOVEMBER THROUGH DECEMBER 2014 PETITION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES and expenses for the personal representative of the estate OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN FOR JANUARY 1, 2015 THROUGH MARCH 23, 2015 | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20150604\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20COATE S\%20Estate\%20of\%20Simon\%20Bernstein.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150604\%20Hearing\%20Tr anscript\%20COATES\%20Estate\%20of\%20 Simon\%20Bernstein.pdf | Scheduled in Simon but Shirley also ruled on. Judge Coates 1st hearing |
| Shirley Trust | 12/15/2015 |  | Transscript Shirley King <br> US Legal Support /Rose, Ted Bernstein | ORDER SETTING TRIAL on AMENDED COMPLAINT (DE 26) COUNT II <br> This matter came before the court on its own motion, for resolution of outstanding issues <br> as required by the October 6, 2014, Order of the Honorable Martin H Colin, the Circuit Court <br> Judge formerly assigned to this case. In that Order, Judge Colin severed trial of Count II of the <br> Plaintiff's Amended Complaint from remaining claims in the action, and stayed all further <br> proceedings in the action pending further Order of the Court. <br> Accordingly, the Court ORDERS <br> as follows: <br> 1. Trial of the issues set forth in Judge Colin's October 6, 2014, Order on Amendments to <br> Pleadings and Stay until Further Order of Court (DE 27) and Count II of Plaintiff's Amended <br> Complaint (DE 26) shall take place on December 15, 2015 @ 9:30AM ; 1 (one) day has been set aside for trial. <br> 2. The Petitioner and the Respondent have an obligation to make a good faith effort to resolve <br> this case. Towards that end, the parties are ordered to attend a pretrial mediation that must take <br> place no later than ten (10) days before the first day of trial of this case. Failure to attend pretrial mediation absent an order waiving same may result in the striking of the case from the | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20151215\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20Phillip s\%20Validity\%20Hearing.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20151215\%20Hearing\%20Tr anscript\%20Phillips\%20Validity\%20Hearin g.pdf |  |


| Supp \# | Hearing In | Hearing Date | Trans cipt | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26 | Shirley Trust | 1/14/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | HEARING IMPROPERLY SCHEDULED WITHOUT NOTICE - SUCCESSOR trustee's motion for appointment of a guardian ad litem to REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S CHILDREN; FOR A Gag order to protect guardian and others; And to strike ELIOT'S FILINGS CERTIFI | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| 27 | Shirley Trust | 2/4/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | MATTER(S) TO BE HEARD: TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO MODIFY FINAL ORDER APPROVING SALE DATED MAY 6, 2015 AND FOR FURTHER injunctive relief CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | Court Callin with Phillips, Standing Issue |
| 28 | Shirley Trust | 2/25/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | MATTER(S) TO BE HEARD: <br> SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF A gUardian ad litem to represent the interests of eliot bernstein's children; For a gag order to protect gUardian and others; And to strike eliot's flings CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing |  |
| 29 | Shirley Trust | 3/28/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | EVIDENTIARY HEARING - TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO MODIFY FINAL ORDER APPROVING SALE DATED MAY 6, 2015 AND FOR FURTHER INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing |
| 30 | Shirley Trust | 4/8/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | TRUSTEE'S AMENDED MOTION TO MODIFY FINAL ORDER APPROVING SALE DATED MAY 6, 2015 AND FOR FURTHER INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY ELIOT BERNSTEIN SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT OF COURT + TRUSTEE'S MOTION TO MODIFY FINAL ORDER APPROVING SALE DATED MAY 6, 2015 AND FOR FURTHER INJUNCTIVE RELIEF | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing |
| 31 | Shirley Trust | 4/8/2016 | No | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE'S AMENDED MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF A GUARDIAN AD LITEM TO REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF ELIOT BERNSTEIN'S CHILDREN CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | No Transcript - Rose, Ted Bernstein Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing |
| 32 | Simon Estate | 11/12/2013 | NO | /Feaman | Stansbury Hearing regarding objection to production of Lewin | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 33 | Simon Estate | 11/21/2013 | NO | /Feaman | Stansbury Hearing Extension of Time | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 34 | Simon Estate | 12/11/2013 | NO | /Feaman | Stansbury Motion to Intervene Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 35 | Simon Estate | 1/14/2014 | NO | /Manceri | Motion to Transfer and Consolidate | No Transcript - Manceri Order Hearing | No Transcript - Manceri Order Hearing | Judge French - Cancels hearing on 12/24/13 |
| 36 | Simon Estate | 1/23/2014 | NO | /Manceri | MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD for Ted Bernstein, 01/23/14 AT 8:45 A.M. F/B: MARK R MANCERI E-FILED | No Transcript - Manceri Order Hearing | No Transcript - Manceri Order Hearing |  |
| 37 | Stansbury <br> Lawsuit | 1/28/2014 | NO | /Feaman | WEST PALM BEACH - HEARING MOTION TO WITHDRAWWITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD F/B/ATTY MARK MANCERI FROM STANSBURY LAWSUIT Case \#50 2012 CA 013933 MB AA or 502012CA013933XXXXMB | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 38 | Simon Estate | 2/18/2014 |  | /Spallina | MOTION/MATTER: PETITION FOR RESIGNATION AND DISCHARGE (copy attached) FILED BY: Robert L. Spallina, Esq. | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta <br> te/20140218\%20Hearing\%20Bernstein\%20- <br> \%202\%2018\%2014\%20hearing\%20transcript.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140218\%20Hearing\%20Be rnstein\%20- <br> \%202\%2018\%2014\%20hearing\%20transc ript.pdf |  |
| 39 | Simon Estate | 2/19/2014 |  | /Spallina | Hearing Colin Continuation of 2/18/14 hearing - Simon Estate - Shirley Estate | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140219\%20Hearing\%20Bernstein\%20- <br> \%202\%2019\%2014\%20hearing\%20transcript\%20 ( <br> 2).pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140219\%20Hearing\%20Be rnstein\%20- <br> \%202\%2019\%2014\%20hearing\%20transc ript\%20(2).pdf |  |


| Hearing In | Hearing Trans <br> cipt  | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simon Estate | 5/23/2014 YES | /Brown | Colin; Curator's Motion for Instructions Regarding 2012 Will;Curator's Motion for Instructions Regarding May 1, 2014(1) Curator's Motion for Instruction/Determination Regarding Estate Entitlement to Life Insuranc(2) Petition for Appointment of Administra | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140523\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20Estate \%20of\%20Simon\%20Bernstein.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140523\%20Hearing\%20Tr anscript\%20Estate\%20of\%20Simon\%20B ernstein.pdf |  |
| Simon Estate | 6/19/2014 Yes | LISA GREENWELL, Court Reporter PLEASANTON, GREENHILL, MEEK \& MARSAA 561/833.7811/Brown | One is a Motion For Instructions Regarding Authority to Liquidate an IRA and To do an inventory to make sure they're there at the residence | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta <br> te/20140619\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- <br> \%20HEARING\%20-\%206-19-14.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140619\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%20HEARING\%20-\%206-19-14.pdf |  |
| Simon Estate | 6/24/2014 NO | /Brown | The Honorable Martin Colin - Curator's Motion for Instructions Regarding Authority to Retain Counsel filed by Curator | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 8/19/2014 Yes <br> Part 1 <br> and <br> Part 2 | Lisa Mudrick, RPR, FPR @ Mudrick Court Reporting, Inc.(561) 615-8181/Feaman and Everman \& Everman, Inc. 1101 N Olive Ave West Palm Beach FI 33401 | Motion to Special Set Petition to Remove Successor Trustee, Ted Bernstein | Part 1 <br> http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta <br> te/20140819\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- <br> \%20HEARING\%20-\%208-19-14\%20- <br> \%20full\%20hearing.pdf <br> and <br> http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20140819\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20HEARING\%2OPa rt\%202\%20Part\%201\%20missing.pdf | Part 1 <br> http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140819\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%20HEARING\%20-\%208-19-14\%20\%20full\%2Ohearing.pdf and http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20140819\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20HEARING\%20Part\%202\%20Part\%201\% 20missing.pdf |  |
| Simon Estate | 9/18/2014 No | /Brown | Matters: 1. Curator's Petition for Approval of Accounting and for Discharge; <br> 2. Third Petition for Payment of Curator's Fee; <br> 3. Fourth Petition for Payment of Curator's Fee; and <br> 4. Fifth Petition for Payment of Curator's Fee. <br> And <br> NOTICE OF SPECIAL SET HEARING - Curator's Petition for Approval of <br> Accounting and for Discharge | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing |  |


| Supp \# | Hearing In | Hearing Date | Trans cipt | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 | Simon Estate | 9/24/2014 |  | Court Reporter = US Legal Support - Susan Shelling 835-0220 sueshelling@aol.com /Eliot | " PETITION TO REMOVE TED BERNSTEIN AS ALLEGED SUCCESSOR <br> TRUSTEE OF THE <br> ALLEGED SIMON BERNSTEIN REVOCABLE TRUST and subpart exhibits <br> as they relate to <br> removing Ted Bernstein: <br> and <br> (AMENDED) FOR REMOVAL OF PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE AND <br> trustee of the estates and trust of simon and shirley <br> BERNSTEIN IN ALL FIDUCIAL CAPACITIES ON THE COURT'S OWN <br> INITIATIVE UNEXECUTED ORDER A TT ACHED EFILED <br> and <br> STANSBURY, WILLIAM E <br> PETITION TO REMOVE TED BERNSTEIN AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE <br> OF THE SIMON BERNSTEIN REVOCABLE TRUST <br> and <br> RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO THE APPOINTMENT OF TED BERNSTEIN <br> AS <br> SUCCESSOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE AND MOTION FOR THE <br> APPOINTMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT THIRD PARTY AS BOTH <br> SUCCESSOR <br> PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE AND TRUSTEE OF THE SIMON BERNSTEIN <br> TRUSTAGREEMENT <br> and <br> JoInder in Petition filed by Eliot iv an bernstein for removal OF TRUSTEE AND FOR TRUST ACCOUNTING FIB WILLIAM E. <br> STANSBURY, CREDITOR OF THE E/O SIMON BERNSTEIN E-FILED and | No Trancript but transcribed by US Legal | No Trancript but transcribed by US Legal |  |
| 46 | Simon Estate | 10/30/2014 | No | /Glaskow | IN RE: EST ATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN - Motion to Withdraw Glaskow Attorney for Jill and Lisa | No Transcript - Glaskow Order Hearing | No Transcript - Glaskow Order Hearing |  |
| 47 | Simon Estate | 10/30/2014 | No | /Feaman | Creditor, William E. Stansbury's Motion for Discharge from Further Responsibility for the Funding of the Estate's Participation in the Chicago Life Insurance Litigation and for Assumption of Responsibility by the Estate | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 48 | Simon Estate | 12/18/2014 | NO | /Feaman | HEARING Motion of Creditor, William E. Stansbury, for Discharge from Further Responsibility for the Funding of the Estate's Participation in the Chicago Life Insurance Litigation and for Assumption of Responsibility by the Estate | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| 49 | Simon Estate | 12/23/2014 | NO | /O'Connell | IN RE: ESTATE OF: PROBATE DIVISION STATUS CONFERENCE ON PROPOSED FILING OF SUCCESSOR PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE'S MOTION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO ENTER INTO AND APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing |  |
| 50 | Simon Estate | 1/5/2015 | NO | /O'Connell | HEARING - STATUS CONFERENCE ON PROPOSED FILING OF SUCCESSOR personal representative's motion to intervene | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing |  |
| 51 | Simon Estate | 1/8/2015 |  | /Feaman | Motion of Creditor, William E. Stansbury, for Discharge from Further Responsibility for the Funding of the Estate's Participation in the Chicago Life Insurance Litigation and for Assumption of Responsibility by the Estate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta } \\ & \text { te/20150108\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- } \\ & \text { \%20HEARING\%20-\%201-8-15\%20- } \\ & \text { \%20Mot\%20Instructions\%20re-\%20Mortgage.pdf } \end{aligned}$ | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150108\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%20HEARING\%20-\%201-8-15\%20- <br> \%20Mot\%20Instructions\%20re- <br> \%20Mortgage.pdf |  |


| Hearing In | Hearing Date | Trans cipt | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Simon Trust | 1/8/2015 | YES | /Rose, Ted Bernstein | TED S. BERNSTEIN, AS SUCCESSSOR TRUSTEE OF THE SIMON L. BERNSTEIN TRUST, MOTION FOR INSTRUCTIONS | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20150108\%20TRANSCRIPT\%20- \%20HEARING\%20-\%201-8-15\%20- \%20Mot\%20Instructions\%20re-\%20Mortgage.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150108\%20TRANSCRIPT\% 20-\%2OHEARING\%20-\%201-8-15\%20- <br> \%20Mot\%20Instructions\%20re- <br> \%20Mortgage.pdf |  |
| Simon Estate | 1/13/2015 | NO | /Eliot | Statement of Claims Eliot and Brian O'Connell | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 1/27/2015 | NO | Steno Beth Kelly @ Pleasanton Greenhill Meek and Marsaa/Feamn | MOTION OF CREDITOR, WILLIAM E. STANSBURY, FOR DISCHARGE FROM FURTHER RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FUNDING OF THE ESTATE'S PARTICIPATION IN THE CHICAGO LIFE INSURANCE LITIGATION AND FOR ASSUMPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY BY THE ESTATE SUCC | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 1/29/2015 | NO | /O'Connell | HEARING 502012CP4391XXXXSB Simon Estate - STATUS CONFERENCE ON MOTION TO CONTINUE SPECIALLY SET HEARING ON FEBRUARY 9 , 2015 | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Trust | 2/10/2015 | NO | /Eliot | hearing judge keyser - Motion to move case to honorable JUDGE MARTIN COLIN - AGREED ORDER | NO | NO | 502014CA014637XXXXM <br> B Judge Keyser |
| Simon Estate | 2/26/2015 | NO | /Brown | Petition for Discharge of Administrator Ad Litem | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 3/18/2015 | NO | /Brown | SIMON ESTATE BEN BROWN MOTION Amended Petition for Discharge of Administrator Ad Litem and Payment of Administrator Ad Litem's Fees | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing | No Transcript - Benjamin Brown Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 3/25/2015 | NO | $\qquad$ | PETITION TO TAKE POSSESSION, STORE, INSPECT AND APPRAISE ESTATE TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 3/31/2015 | NO | /Eliot | Evidentiary Hearing - Statement of Claims Extension | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Trust | 4/2/2015 | NO | Reporter = <br> Pleasonton Greenhill <br> Meek \& Marsaa <br> Cindy Bender 561-833- <br> 7811/Eliot | CHANGED BACK -- HEARING SIMON TRUST - COMPLAINT TO REMOVE theodore stuart bernstein as successor trustee f/b eliot IVAN BERNSTEIN TRANSFER IN FROM 502014CA014637 | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing | No Transcript - Eliot Order Hearing |  |
| Simon Estate | 6/4/2015 |  | /O'Connell | HEARING COATES - PETITION FOR AUTHORIZATION TO MOVE, STORE, AND SELL THE TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 7020 LIONS HEAD LANE PETITION FOR INSTRUCTIONS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ESTATE SHOULD MAKE A LOAN TO ELIOT BERNSTEIN AND FOR OTHER RELIEF | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20150604\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20COATE S\%20Estate\%20of\%20Simon\%20Bernstein.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150604\%20Hearing\%20Tr anscript\%20COATES\%20Estate\%20of\%20 Simon\%20Bernstein.pdf | COATES |
| Simon Estate | 7/30/2015 | NO | /O'Connell | HEARING SIMON ESTATE - STATUS CONFERENCE - TO SCHEDULE A CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE | O'Connell Ordered Hearing | O'Connell Ordered Hearing | PHILLIPS |


| Supp \# | Hearing In | Hearing Date | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Trans } \\ \text { cipt } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | Transcription Service/Party Ordering | Hearing Title | Web Link Transcript | Document Link Transcript | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 64 | Simon Estate | 9/15/2015 |  | /0'Connell | HEARING PHILLIPS 502012CP4391XXXXNB IH SIMON L. BERNSTEIN CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE | http://iviewit.tv/simon\%20and\%20Shirley\%20Esta te/20150915\%20Judge\%20Phillips\%20Hearing\%2 OTranscript\%20\%20Estate\%20of\%20\%20Simon\%20Bersstein.pdf | http://iviewit.tv/Simon\%20and\%20Shirle y\%20Estate/20150915\%20Judge\%20Phill ps\%20Hearing\%20Transcript\%20\%20Estate\% 200 of $\% 20 \% 20$ Simon\% 20 Berns tein.pdf | PHILLIPS |
| 65 | Simon Estate | 3/3/2016 |  | /0'Connell | 1. Petition for Authorization for the Payment of Jewelry Appraisals | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing? |
| 66 | Simon Estate | 3/7/2016 |  | /O'Connell | - PETITION FOR AUTHORIZATION AND RATIFICATION FOR THE PAYMENT OF THE MOVING AND STORAGE OF, AND FOR aUthorization to sell, the tangible personal property PREVIOUSLY LOCATED AT 7020 LIONS HEAD LANE, BOCA RATON, FL. <br> - petition to ha ve the esta te of simon l. bernstein declared the beneficiary of the j.p. morgan chase bank, n.A. IRA ACCOUNT(S). <br> - PETITION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES and expenses for the personal representative of the ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN FOR JULY 1,2015 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 2015. <br> - PETITION FOR ORDER AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES and expenses for the personal representative of the ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN FOR SEPTEMBER 1,2015 THROUGH осtober 31, 2015. <br> - PEtition For order authorizing payment of attorney's fees and expenses for the personal representative of the ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN FOR NOVEMBER 1,2015 THROUGH NOVEMBER 31, 2015. | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | No Transcript - O'Connell Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing? |
| 67 | Simon Estate | 3/7/2016 | NO | /Feaman | HEARING STATUS CONFERENCE - Simon Estate | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing? |
| 68 | Simon Estate | 7/27/2016 | No | /Feaman | Motion of Creditor, William E. Stansbury, for Discharge from Further Responsibility for the Funding of the Estate's Participation in the Chicago <br> Life Insurance Litigation and for Assumption of Responsibility by the Estate and for Reimbursement of Advanced Funds | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | No Transcript - Feaman Order Hearing | Did not attend no standing? |
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IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 15TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA PROBATE/GUARDIANSHIP DIVISION IY CASE NO.: 502011CP000653XXXXSB
IN RE: THE ESTATE OF:
SHIRLEY BERNSTEIN, Deceased

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE, Petitioner,
vs.

TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (AND ALL PARTNERS, ASSOCIATES AND OF COUNSEL) ; ROBERT L. SPALLINA (BOTH PERSONALLY \& PROFESSIONALLY) ; DONALD
R. TESCHER (BOTH PERSONALLY \& PROFESSIONALLY);

THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (AS ALLEGED PERSONAL
REPRESENTATIVE, TRUSTEE, SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE) (BOTH PERSONALLY \& PROFESSIONALLY) ; AND JOHN AND JANE DOE'S (1-5000),

Respondents.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE
THE HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN

South County Courthouse 200 West Atlantic Avenue, Courtroom 8 Delray Beach, Florida 33344

Friday, September 13, 2013 1:30 p.m. - 2:15 p.m.

Stenographically Reported By: JESSICA THIBAULT
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On Behalf of the Petitioner:
ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE 2753 NW 34th Street Boca Raton, Florida 33434
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On Behalf of the Defendants:
LAW OFFICE OF MARK MANCERI, P.A.
2929 East Commercial Blvd., Ste. 702
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33308
(954) 491-7099
mrmlaw@comcast.net
BY: MARK MANCERI, ESQ.
Also present:
Robert Spallina, Esq.
Theodore Bernstein
Mrs. Bernstein, Petitioner's wife

## P R O C E E D I N G S

THE COURT: All right, we're here on the Shirley Bernstein estate, 2011CP000653. Counsel, make your appearances.

MR. MANCERI: Good afternoon, your Honor, Mark Manceri. I'm here on behalf of Robert Spallina and Donald Tescher, named respondents.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Good afternoon, your Honor, my name is Eliot Bernstein, and I'm representing myself pro se.

MR. THEODORE BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, Ted

No one is representing as the
Personal Representative,
Manceri is representing them as estate counsel, their other role. No Personal Rep
because when Si died no one notified the Court and a successor PR or Trustee was never elected. Bernstein, trustee of the estate, and I'm here representing myself today.

THE COURT: Okay, thanks.
Let me just get the case up on the computer, please.

All right, so I set oral argument based upon Mr. Bernstein's emergency motions, and I did so with the cautionary language in the notice of hearing that I assume both of you have, that indicates that I first want to hear what makes this matter emergency as defined by our law, so, because you're pro se, Mr. Bernstein, I want to make sure you're aware
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Counsel knows. This is not an emergency in your mind. It's an emergency as the law calls it an emergency. You're probably going to show me a case or an administrative order and tell me how this is an emergency.

The second part of it is what type of evidentiary hearing we need to have, so you're up first.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, you want me to step up or?

THE COURT: You could do it right from there.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's an emergency
because three of the beneficiaries --
THE COURT: Say again? I couldn't -- you mumbled, I couldn't hear you.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's an emergency because three of the beneficiaries of the estates lives have been put in danger.

THE COURT: Okay, so they're about to be killed?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They're about to be cut off of school, insurance, the necessary care that was set aside in the estates.

THE COURT: So it's not physical harm?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: So it's financial harm?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: Educational harm?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: Show me in either the law or the administrative order where that is defined as an emergency.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If it's not then I made a mistake.

THE COURT: You're supposed to know that. That's why we're having this hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm pro se.
THE COURT: I know. We brought all this judicial effort here. No, sir, this is not a free shot for you.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I thought that it was an emergency.
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THE COURT: No, it's not your thought.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: I cautioned you in the notice of hearing you so came today -- I kind of cautioned you whether this is an emergency, okay? So you need to demonstrate to me where under our laws this situation that you say the
evidence would show is imminently happening, imminent means today, okay, where an emergency exists.

The last two emergencies I did, someone was on the way to the airport waiting to be taken illegally to Iran, a non-hate convention country. We had to get an order out so that Homeland Security would rush down with armed guards and protect a child from going overseas and never coming back to the U.S.

The other one was we had to get an order so police could break down the door to prevent someone from being physically killed or harmed physically.

Those two were emergencies. Is this an emergency like that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I believe so.
THE COURT: Okay, all right, so let me tell you, I'm going to let you go forward. If I do not believe so, get your checkbook out. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: You're going to personally pay for the cost of this.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: It doesn't seem so based upon
what you've told me, but you have this belief that it is. Remember, show me that it's a legal emergency like $I$ gave the example of it. Someone is going to die, be taken out of the jurisdiction, someone's wellbeing today is going to be -- you know, they're going to be without food, they'll be on the street tomorrow.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So is that the type of hearing I need?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.

In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt
THE COURT: Okay. So tell me how that --
what evidence is there that this is an emergency along those lines?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, the estate representatives when my parents died told us that they were understanding the special circumstances me and my three children are in, and that funds had been set aside and not to worry, there would be no delay of paying their living costs and everything that my father and mother had been paying for years to take care of them, and then they were paying that out of a bank account at Legacy Bank.

THE COURT: Who is they?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Mr. Spallina had directed Rachel Walker to pay the expenses of a Legacy bank account. It was being paid. And then Mr. Spallina stated that I should or that Rachel should -- she was fired, she should now turn the accounts over to my wife to start writing checks out of an account we've never seen.

So I said I didn't feel comfortable writing checks out of an account, especially where it appeared my dad was the signer, so I called Legacy Bank with Rachel and they were completely blown away that checks had been being written out of a dead person's account. Nobody had notified them that Simon had deceased. And that no -- by under no means shall I write checks out of that account, and so then Mr. Spallina told me to turn the accounts over to Janet Craig of Oppenheimer, and Oppenheimer was going to pay the bills as it had been done by Rachel in the past. And so we sent her the Legacy account. We thought all that was how things were being done and, you know, he doesn't give us any documents
whatsoever in the estate, so we don't know, you know, what he's operating out of, but Oppenheimer then started to pay the things -first they said, wait a minute, these are school trust funds -- well, they actually said that after they started paying, and they were a

In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt little hesitant that these funds were being used for personal living expenses of everybody, which the other Legacy account had been paying for through an agreement between and my parents. And then what happened was Mr. Spallina directed them to continue, stating he would replenish and replace the funds if he didn't get these other trusts he was in the process of creating for my children in place and use that money he would replenish and replace it.

So the other week or two weeks or a few week ago Janet Craig said that funds are running low and she contacted Mr. Spallina who told her that he's not putting any money into those trusts and that there's nothing there for me, and that basically when that money runs out the kids' insurance, school, their home electricity and everything else I would
consider an emergency for three minor children will be cut off, and that was not --

THE COURT: Let me ask you a question.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: At the time when you say things were as they should be, your parents were alive and they were paying bills of you and your children?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct,
100-percent, through an agreement.
THE COURT: An agreement with them?
mR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. Then who died first?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: My mom.
THE COURT: Because this is what -- you
filed it under your mom's estate.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Is your father alive or dead?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: My father is
deceased today a year ago.
THE COURT: All right. So you're saying
that after your father died, however it
happened, bills for you and your children
continued to be paid somehow?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: First out of an
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THE COURT: And then it stopped?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It stopped. Then it was transferred to Oppenheimer.

THE COURT: And they paid for a little while?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: And when did that stop?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct, just on August 28th, with one-day's notice.

THE COURT: Okay. So the bills that they were paying for you were what bills?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: All of them.
THE COURT: All the bills.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Health insurance, electricity, water, food, clothing, everything, 100-percent.

THE COURT: When did the emergency take place?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On August 28th. They told me if I didn't sign releases that Robert wanted me to sign and turn the money over to my brother, the remaining corpus of the trust, that they were going to shut the funds
off as of that day.
THE COURT: And they did?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not 100 -percent sure, because then I asked them for their operating documents that Mr. Spallina had sent them, and once again we've got un-notarized documents --

THE COURT: We'll talk about the notary thing in a second.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Then we have new improperly notarized documents authorizing the trust to operate, and they sent me incomplete documents which are unsigned on every page of the trust agreement, so they're telling me and I've asked them three times if they have signed copies and three times they've sent me unsigned copies.

THE COURT: Okay, but what bills today --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: All of them.
THE COURT: What bills are unpaid as overdo today?
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one.
THE COURT: What's overdue today?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Health insurance is
one.
THE COURT: All right, name the health insurance company.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's COBRA.
THE COURT: COBRA is not a company.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Blue Cross.
THE COURT: Blue Cross, okay. How much is
overdue to Blue Cross today?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: $\$ 2,000$ or so.
THE COURT: It's not $\$ 2,000$ a day.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: A month.
THE COURT: $\$ 2,000$ a month is the health insurance bill?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: When was that bill due?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, this is the
problem. All of the bills are going to them and they don't share with me any of that.

THE COURT: So how do you know that you don't have health insurance coverage?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Only because it's paid by them on that date. Usually on the first.

THE COURT: September 1st?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes. As of

September 1st I don't believe they have --
THE COURT: Is the coverage in effect today?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know.
THE COURT: If you don't know, how do you know that it's an emergency?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I just know they haven't paid it.

THE COURT: Okay, so --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't have --
THE COURT: So you have coverage you said as of August 31st you had coverage?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We don't know. We don't have an accounting if she stated that, I'm sorry.
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THE COURT: Okay, so you may be covered, you may not be covered?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: What other bill is unpaid as
of today.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And that's my wife
and my children too.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Again, they have all
the bills, so when they're due, like the
electric was due on the 28th, then they usually pay it. I don't even get the bills. So the bills are going straight to Oppenheimer.

THE COURT: How do you know
authoritatively that they're not being paid?
Ma'am, you can't speak. You're not a
lawyer, right?
MRS. BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Up, move to the back.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You want her to go back?

THE COURT: Yes, because she's disruptive. I can't speak to you and hear her.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So stay there in absolute silence. You could write something if you want, is that agreed?

MRS. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay, go ahead. How do you know these monthly bills are not being paid? How do you know the way you know today is Friday, you know what your name is, know meaning indisputable knowledge.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I can't say for certainty since I don't receive it and manage
and pay the bills.
THE COURT: Well then how is it an emergency if you don't know?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, because we know that within this next month if electricity isn't paid and there's no money to pay it and he doesn't reimburse the trusts that all those bills on whatever date they were due were lapsing in the next few hours.
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THE COURT: From today?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: From the 28th.
THE COURT: The 28th of August?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct, sir. THE COURT: All right. So you don't know if they've been paid or not. You still have your electric on?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Are any services shut off?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
MR. ROTHMAN: Maybe like things like lawn and stuff, the lawn guys have been coming, said we owe them money, which we've never heard that from this guy knocking on the door.

THE COURT: All right. Is the lawn an emergency situation?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. You just asked if any bills --

THE COURT: These are not emergencies then.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Remember, you filed a motion that stopped the courthouse from working.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm very sorry.
THE COURT: We thought you were ready to die on the day you filed the motion.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm very sorry.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I believed it was an emergency. The minor children are in there.

THE COURT: Let me ask, how old are you?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm 50.
THE COURT: Can you pay an electric bill?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Why not?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't have any employment.

THE COURT: Why not? If there's an emergency and you're not eating and you have children --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's very
complicated, but --
THE COURT: Well, could you work to pay your electric bill? If that made a difference?
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MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, I haven't been able to gain employment due to Ricco-related-type crimes that have been committed against me and my family.

THE COURT: So your kids are without food, you would have them starve rather then go over to Burger King or Dunkin Donuts and get a job doing --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I've tried all those things.

THE COURT: And they won't hire you?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Let me explain.
THE COURT: Will they hire you to make enough money?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. And that's why my father and mother had set aside these funds to pay those bills because they understood the gravity --

THE COURT: So here's what we'll do, we're going to have a hearing, tell me if you're comfortable, whether there's any employment you could get, so I'm going to bring the people
from Florida State Employment who tell me there's hundreds of jobs today that you could work.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: You could start today as a laborer right outside this courthouse. Why don't you do that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, because if I
do that $I$ have tax liens that are --
THE COURT: Who cares? You want to feed your children. They're going to pay you money to feed your children.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, I'll explain. I have tax liens which are under investigation by the inspector general of the tax administration department, currently ongoing, that were put on me as part of the efforts in a Ricco-related lawsuit that I'm involved in. These are just the facts, I'm just telling you --

THE COURT: What's to stop you from working as a laborer?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Because they then attach my wages --
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THE COURT: They don't even know that
you're working, and you have an emergency, you could feed your children.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They know I'm
working.
THE COURT: How do they know you're
working?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, actually, if
you read the last articles $I$ put in the petition six or five, one of those two, I put in the articles that have been released in the press that say that they were misusing joint terrorism task force funds and resources to monitor and violate our rights through the Patriot Act violations, and that they have done that to me in the related cases in the federal court.

THE COURT: All right, whatever you say. I don't think you want -- if you want a hearing on whether you could go to work today, physically go to work and pay, I'll give you that hearing right now and I'll get someone from Florida Employment. Here's the deal, you lose all your motions as soon as they tell you that you could go outside and work. Do you want that hearing or not? You
could physically earn enough money to pay for food for your children today, you tell me you can't do -- that someone is going to tackle you and stop you from working outside as a laborer to get enough money to feed your children? That's the emergency, your children are starving. You're a parent. You're going to tell me you're going to let your children starve and not work to earn enough money to feed them, that's what you're telling me, correct?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. Well, I won't tell you that because, I guess, if you say there's some job that you could get me I'll get it.

THE COURT: There's tons of jobs.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I know, I've applied
for so many over the years --
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THE COURT: I mean maybe not as a CEO of a company. \$10, \$9.00 an hour jobs --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I've applied for minimum wage and had trouble, believe me.

THE COURT: I'm talking about getting work today -- if you tell me you can't work today I'll have a hearing on that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I can work today.
THE COURT: Well, then you could feed your children today.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, if I could get a job --

THE COURT: That's not an emergency. You might have a hearing on it down the line, but it's not an emergency.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: An emergency means my kids are starving, they haven't eaten, there's no food, and I can't legally get them food because I can't work. I have people who are blind, who have no arms and legs, and they can't work.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: That's different, that's not you.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. Can't work and don't want to work, think they're reasons not to work are two different things.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. What's your position on the emergency before we go to some of these others issues which concern me about what he
said.
MR. MANCERI: Good afternoon, your Honor. As I stated in my opening, I represent Robert Spallina and Mr. Tescher. I would like to apologize --

THE COURT: So their roles are what in this case?

MR. MANCERI: They were counsel or are counsel for the estate of Shirley Bernstein, as well as counsel for the estate of Simon Bernstein, who is in front of Judge French. THE COURT: Okay.
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MR. MANCERI: But before I make my presentation, I would just like to apologize for Mr. Tescher's absence. He's out of town for the holiday.

THE COURT: Okay. Who are the PR's that you represent?

MR. MANCERI: Well, Shirley Bernstein there is no technically any PR because we had the estate closed.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MANCERI: And what emanated from Mr. Bernstein's 57-page filing, which falls lawfully short of any emergency, was a petition
to reopen the estate, so technically nobody has letters right now.

Simon Bernstein, your Honor, who died a year ago today as you heard, survived his wife, Shirley Bernstein, who died December 10, 2010. Simon Bernstein was the PR of his wife's estate.

As a result of his passing, and in attempt to reopen the estate we're looking to have the estate reopened. So nobody has letters right now, Judge. The estate was closed.

THE COURT: So you agree that in Shirley's estate it was closed January of this year, there was an order of discharge, I see that. Is that true?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know.
THE COURT: Do you know that that's true?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, I believe.
THE COURT: So final disposition and the order got entered that Simon, your father -MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: -- he came to court and said I want to be discharged, my wife's estate is closed and fully administered.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. I think it
happened after --
THE COURT: No, I'm looking at it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What date did that happen?

THE COURT: January 3, 2013. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He was dead.
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MR. MANCERI: That's when the order was signed, yes, your Honor. THE COURT: He filed it, physically came to court.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh.
THE COURT: So let me see when he actually filed it and signed the paperwork. November. What date did your dad die?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: September. It's hard to get through. He does a lot of things when he's dead.

THE COURT: I have all of these waivers by Simon in November. He tells me Simon was dead at the time.

MR. MANCERI: Simon was dead at the time, your Honor. The waivers that you're talking about are waivers from the beneficiaries, I believe.

THE COURT: No, it's waivers of
accountings.
MR. MANCERI: Right, by the beneficiaries. THE COURT: Discharge waiver of service of discharge by Simon, Simon asked that he not have to serve the petition for discharge. MR. MANCERI: Right, that was in his petition. When was the petition served?

THE COURT: November 21st. MR. SPALLINA: Yeah, it was after his date of death.

THE COURT: Well, how could that happen legally? How could Simon --

MR. MANCERI: Who signed that?
THE COURT: -- ask to close and not serve a petition after he's dead?

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, what happened was is the documents were submitted with the waivers originally, and this goes to Mr. Bernstein's fraud allegation. As you know, your Honor, you have a rule that you have to have your waivers notarized. And the original waivers that were submitted were not notarized, so they were kicked back by the clerk. They were then notarized by a staff person from Tescher and Spallina admittedly in error. They
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THE COURT: So let me tell you because I'm going to stop all of you folks because I think you need to be read your Miranda warnings.

MR. MANCERI: I need to be read my Miranda warnings?

THE COURT: Everyone of you might have to be.

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: Because I'm looking at a formal document filed here April 9, 2012, signed by Simon Bernstein, a signature for him.

MR. MANCERI: April 9th, right.
THE COURT: April 9th, signed by him, and notarized on that same date by Kimberly. It's a waiver and it's not filed with The Court until November 19th, so the filing of it, and it says to The Court on November 19th, the undersigned, Simon Bernstein, does this, this, and this. Signed and notarized on April 9, 2012. The notary said that she witnessed Simon
sign it then, and then for some reason it's not filed with The Court until after his date of death with no notice that he was dead at the time that this was filed.

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: All right, so stop, that's enough to give you Miranda warnings. Not you personally --

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: Are you involved? Just tell me yes or no.

MR. SPALLINA: I'm sorry?
THE COURT: Are you involved in the transaction?

MR. SPALLINA: I was involved as the lawyer for the estate, yes. It did not come to my attention until Kimberly Moran came to me after she received a letter from the Governor's Office stating that they were investigating some fraudulent signatures on some waivers that were signed in connection with the closing of
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THE COURT: What about the fact, counsel, let me see who signed this. Okay, they're all the same as to -- so let me ask this, I have a
document where Eliot, you're Eliot, right?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Where you purportedly waived accounting, agreed to a petition to discharge on May 15th, and you signed that. Do you remember doing that? Do you remember that or not? I'm looking at it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I remember signing it and sending it with a disclaimer that $I$ was signing it because my father was under duress and only to relieve this stress that he was being --

THE COURT: Well, I don't care -- I'm not asking you why you signed it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I also signed it with the expressed -- when I signed it I was coned by Mr. Spallina that he was going to send me all the documents of the estate to review. I would have never lied on this form when I signed it. It's saying that $I$ saw and $I$ never saw --

THE COURT: Let me ask you --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I lied.
THE COURT: Did you have your signature notarized?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Kimberly Moran never signed or notarized his signature?

MR. MANCERI: Yes, your Honor, and that's been addressed with the Governor's office.

THE COURT: You need to address this with
me.
MR. MANCERI: I am going to address it
with you.
THE COURT: Here's what I don't understand because this is part of the problem here, is that Shirley has an estate that's being administered by Simon.

MR. MANCERI: Correct.
THE COURT: There comes a time where they
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MR. MANCERI: Correct.
THE COURT: Waivers are sent out, that's kind of SOP, and people sign off on that.

MR. MANCERI: Right.
THE COURT: And why are they held up for six months, and when they're filed it's after Simon is already deceased?

MR. MANCERI: They were originally filed away, your Honor, under the signature of the people.

THE COURT: No, they weren't filed, that's the whole thing. I'm looking at the file date, filed with The Court.

MR. MANCERI: No, they were returned by the clerk because they didn't have notarization. We have affidavits from all those people, Judge.

THE COURT: Well you may have that they got sent up here.

MR. MANCERI: We have affidavits from all of those people.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Including Simon?
THE COURT: Slow down. You know how we know something is filed? We see a stamp.

MR. MANCERI: It's on the docket sheet, I understand.

THE COURT: So it's stamped in as filed in November. The clerk doesn't have -- now, they may have rejected it because it wasn't notarized, and that's perhaps what happened, but if in the meantime waiting cured the deficiency of the document, two things happen you're telling me, one, Simon dies.

MR. MANCERI: Correct.

THE COURT: And when those documents are filed with the clerk eventually in November they're filed and one of the documents says, I, Simon, in the present.

MR. MANCERI: Of Ms. Moran.
THE COURT: No, not physically present, I Simon, I would read this in November Simon saying I waive -- I ask that I not have to have an accounting and I want to discharge, that

In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt request is being made in November.

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: He's dead.
MR. MANCERI: I agree, your Honor.
THE COURT: Who filed that document?
MR. MANCERI: Robert, do you know who filed that document in your office?

MR. SPALLINA: I would assume Kimberly did.

MR. MANCERI: Ms. Moran.
THE COURT: Who is she?
MR. MANCERI: She's a staff person at Tescher and Spallina.

THE COURT: When she filed these, and one would think when she filed these the person who purports to be the requesting party is at least
alive.
MR. MANCERI: Understood, Judge.
THE COURT: Not alive. So, well -- we're going to come back to the notary problem in a second.

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: In the meantime, based upon all that I discharge the estate, it's closed.

Here's what I don't understand on your side, you're representing yourself, but the rules still apply. You then file, Eliot Bernstein, emergency petitions in this closed estate, it's closed.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You reopened it.
THE COURT: When did I reopen it?
MR. MANCERI: No, it hasn't been reopened, your Honor.

THE COURT: There's an order that I entered in May of 2013 denying an emergency petition to freeze assets. You filed this one in May. Do you remember doing that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I believe so.
THE COURT: And what you said was there's an emergency in May, you want to freeze the estate assets appointing you PR, investigate
the fraud documents, and do a whole host of other things, and the estate had been closed. The reason why it was denied among other
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MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I paid $\$ 50$ to
someone.
THE COURT: You may have paid to file what you filed, but there's no order reopening the estate.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, that's my mistake.

THE COURT: It's closed, the PR is discharged, they all went home.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And I filed to reopen because we discovered the fraudulent documents.

THE COURT: But then you still had to ask to reopen --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And notice, your Honor, that they haven't come to you in all of that time, he said he just got notified from the governor the other day about this fraud, I put it in your court and served him months ago
and he never came to me or you or anybody else to know that the police are calling him, the sheriff and the governor's Office.

THE COURT: Then you filed another emergency similarly, served you folks, Tescher and Spallina. I denied it because it wasn't an emergency because nothing was happening I thought had to happen on the day or two after.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, now that I
understand emergency --
THE COURT: The estate wasn't open and it really wasn't an emergency at the time. And then you filed a motion in the ordinary course to have things heard, and a motion to -- bunch of other motions, to remove PR.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, with each successive crime we found -- by the way, that's kind of why this is an emergency because with the use of these fraudulent documents a bunch of other crimes are taking place.

THE COURT: Okay. Representing yourself is probably not the easiest thing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I had counsel, your Honor, but Mr. Spallina abused her so much and
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she ran up a $\$ 10,000$ bill．

THE COURT：Doesn＇t help me．
MR．ELIOT BERNSTEIN：Doesn＇t help you， okay．

THE COURT：Then in August you started again，September you started again，and at least I set the hearing because it＇s kind of hard when I read your allegations I couldn＇t figure it out．Now I think，okay－－so now let me ask you this，counsel．

MR．MANCERI：Yes，sir．
THE COURT：So the pleadings get filed， the estate gets closed．

MR．MANCERI：Correct．
THE COURT：Simon dies．So what happened with Shirley＇s estate？

MR．MANCERI：Shirley＇s estate is closed， as you said．

THE COURT：I know the administration is closed．What happened with her estate？Where did that go？Did she have a will？

MR．MANCERI：Her assets went into trusts， and her husband had a power of appointment which he exercised in favor of Mr．Bernstein＇s children．

THE COURT：Okay．

MR．MANCERI：And that leads to the trust that he mentioned at Oppenheimer which he mislead The Court as to what＇s happening with that．

THE COURT：Let me slow you down．
MR．MANCERI：Okay．
THE COURT：So her estate assets went into a trust？

MR．MANCERI：Correct．
THE COURT：And that trust is－－
MR．MANCERI：And Ted Bernstein，I
believe，is the trustee of that trust．
THE COURT：And you＇re brothers？
MR．THEODORE BERNSTEIN：That＇s correct．
THE COURT：All right．So then－－so Simon really wasn＇t alive long when he died as trustee？

MR．MANCERI：Not terribly long．
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THE COURT: All right. So he was a trustee. Was she a trustee as well?

MR. MANCERI: He died, your Honor. Again she died December 10, 2010. He died September of 2012.

THE COURT: Right, but was he a trustee also of Shirley's trust?

MR. MANCERI: Yes.
THE COURT: So she dies, the estate is closed, her assets are in a trust. Simon then dies. What happened with his estate? Judge French is hearing it, but tell me what happened.

MR. MANCERI: My understanding is that money went into a trust for the grandchildren.

THE COURT: Grandchildren of Eliot?
MR. MANCERI: Well there's actually ten of them, ten grandchildren, which he has three.

THE COURT: So the beneficiary level for Simon was he skipped over his children and gave everything to the grandchildren?

MR. MANCERI: That's correct.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: That's not what happened with your father's estate?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: That's not what the rule says to do?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: What does the rule say to do?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The rule is not properly notarized. He didn't appear --

THE COURT: What did the will say that The Court used?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The Court filed a will and amended trust, both improperly notarized.

THE COURT: You didn't answer my question, so stop speaking.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: If you don't answer me you give up your right to participate. Stop, don't speak, all right, because you waived your right because you refused to answer my question,
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okay. So I'll let you answer it.
MR. MANCERI: If I can, your Honor.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. MANCERI: The ten grandchildren shares
-- and I want to be clear on this, this gentleman is only a tangible personal property beneficiary. He and his own proper person. And the mother. That's all he's entitled to. No cash request, nothing directly to him, because of his financial problems among other issues.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MANCERI: He has been asked to
establish accounts for the benefit of his children and he refused to do it.

THE COURT: I'm not interested in that, here's what I'm interested in.

MR. MANCERI: All right.
THE COURT: So before this latest realm of pleadings were filed, both parents are deceased?

MR. MANCERI: Yes.
THE COURT: They both have trusts?
MR. MANCERI: Right.
THE COURT: Simon's trusts are for the benefit of the grandchildren?

MR. MANCERI: Correct.
THE COURT: And Shirley's trust is for the benefit of who?

MR. MANCERI: The grandchildren now
because Simon died.
THE COURT: So children-level, Eliot, Ted were skipped over as beneficiaries?

MR. MANCERI: That's correct, your Honor.
THE COURT: Now, tell me the best you can the way Eliot described that there was some deal that had been in effect with Shirley and Simon while they were alive that kept on going
after Shirley died to help support his children.

MR. MANCERI: That I can't comment on personally, your Honor, because I never met either one of them.

THE COURT: Do you know anything about
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that?
MR. MANCERI: He was the draftsman. His
firm was the draftsman.
THE COURT: So did Shirley and --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They didn't draft --
THE COURT: Stop. Next time you speak out
of turn you will be held in contempt of court.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sorry.
THE COURT: Why get yourself in trouble?
You're being rude.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sorry.
THE COURT: So is it true that when they were alive they were helping to support Eliot's family?

MR. SPALLINA: To the best of my
knowledge, yes, sir.
THE COURT: So after Shirley died, did
that continue?
MR. SPALLINA: Yes, I assume so, that Si
was paying bills.
THE COURT: And when he died in September of last year, what happened, if anything?

MR. SPALLINA: There was an account that we set up in the name of Bernstein Family Reality. That was owned by three old trusts not that we created, but were created by Mr. Bernstein in 2006 that owned the house that the family lives in, so there was an LLC that was set up, Bernstein Family Realty, LLC, there's the three children's trust that own the membership interest in that, and there was a bank account at Legacy Bank that had a small amount of money that Si's assistant Rachel had been paying the bills out of on behalf of the trusts.

When Mr. Bernstein died, Oppenheimer, as trustee of the three trusts and in control of the operations of that entity, assigned themselves as manager, had the account moved from Legacy to Oppenheimer, and continued to pay the bills they could with the small amount of money that was in the Legacy account.

At this time, the Legacy account was terminated because there were no funds left,
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THE COURT: Of the grandchildren?
MR. SPALLINA: Of the grandchildren. And it was probably at the time that Mr. Bernstein died about $\$ 80,000$ in each of those trusts last September.

THE COURT: Okay, so then what happened?
MR. SPALLINA: So over the course of the last year -- the kids go to private school, that's an expensive bill that they pay, think it's approximately $\$ 65,000$. There were other expenses throughout the year. The trust assets as of this week I spoke to Janet Craig, have depleted down collectively across the three trusts for about \$25,000.

THE COURT: Total left?
MR. SPALLINA: Total left in the three trusts.

THE COURT: Any other trusts?
MR. SPALLINA: Again, this is not part of the estate right now, so let's leave the estate of Shirley and Si completely separate. Just trying to get to the issue that Mr. Bernstein
spoke about first.
THE COURT: Right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oppenheimer called me and said that the trusts are coming to the end of their useful life, it doesn't pay to administer them anymore. They're going to make final distribution to Mr. Bernstein and his wife as the guardians of their children.

They sent out standard waivers and releases for him to sign in exchange for the remaining money that was there. There was a disagreement that ensued and I have the e-mail correspondence between Eliot and Janet Craig at Oppenheimer that this is extortion and that Mr. Spallina and you have devised a plan not to give us the rest of the money. That's not the case at all. In fact, we told them to distribute the rest of the money, there's been $\$ 12,000$ in bills submitted to them that they are either paying today or on Monday, and the $\$ 14,000$ or some-odd dollars that would be left
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this. There's also some expenses outstanding on accounting fees and tax preparation fees.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, what's the other part of the estate planning that Shirley or Simon had, another trust?

MR. SPALLINA: Both of their estates say that at the death of the second of us to die, pursuant to Si's exercise over his wife's assets, that all of those assets would go down to ten grandchildren's trust created under their dockets.

Mr. Bernstein was on a call while his father was alive with his other four siblings where he had called me and said, Robert, I think we need to do a phone call with my children to explain to them that I'm going to give this to the ten grandchildren.

THE COURT: And that happened?
MR. SPALLINA: And that happened.
THE COURT: So right now the status, there's a trust that deals with that, or more than one trust.

MR. SPALLINA: There's both Si's estates and Shirley's estates basically say after and again there is some litigation.

THE COURT: And that's different than this \$14,000 --

MR. SPALLINA: Yeah, those are three trusts that were just designed to hold.

THE COURT: Who's administering those trusts?

MR. SPALLINA: Those trusts, Ted Bernstein is the trustee of his mother's trust and holds three assets.

THE COURT: Who is the trustee of the father's trust?

MR. SPALLINA: Don Tescher and myself.
THE COURT: And what are those trusts doing with trust assets?

MR. SPALLINA: On the estate side there
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THE COURT: So what's the total corpus of the what I'll call the ten grandchildren's trust of both grandparents?

MR. SPALLINA: Not taking into account the litigation?

THE COURT: Well, no, you haven't paid anything out yet.

MR. SPALLINA: I would say it's approximately $\$ 4$ million.

THE COURT: So there's litigation going on in Simon's --

MR. SPALLINA: Estate.
THE COURT: And at some point when that claim is resolved the trust will then be administered by your firm and...

MR. SPALLINA: No, that's not the case. Each of the adult children for their own children are designated to serve as trustee of their children's trust.

THE COURT: So a distribution takes place then once the money gets to the trust age?

MR. SPALLINA: Correct, and today again the Shirley Bernstein trust does have liquid assets in it. There was two properties, real estate properties, the residential home and a condo on the beach. The condo on the beach sold back in April or May. There were funds that came into the account at that time. Ted
was going to make partial distribution. He sent out an e-mail with tax I.D. numbers and the naming of the trust to the five children for the purposes of them opening up the accounts.

THE COURT: Okay, what happened?
MR. SPALLINA: Seven of ten accounts were opened and were actually funded this week with $\$ 80,000$.
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THE COURT: Total or each?
MR. SPALLINA: Each.
THE COURT: Three of Eliot's --
MR. SPALLINA: Are not open. And we've asked multiple --

THE COURT: And he executed documents to open $\$ 240,000$ immediately or very quickly go into those accounts?

MR. SPALLINA: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. SPALLINA: Now, there was a question from our client as trustee of his mother's trust because he has apprehension as do the other siblings as to whether or not Mr. Bernstein is the proper trustee for that trust.

THE COURT: Okay, all right.
MR. SPALLINA: We had discussions about possibly making emergency distributions to pay the expenses, but not necessarily --

THE COURT: Not giving the money directly to him.

MR. SPALLINA: Not necessarily put in all $\$ 80,000$ in all three of those trusts.

THE COURT: Does the trust pay expenses directly or give money to the parent who pays the expenses? Do you pay the electric bill or do you give money to Eliot to pay the electric bill?

MR. SPALLINA: Today?
THE COURT: Now, how does that work with the others kids?

MR. SPALLINA: They were just funded, but normally the trustee of the trust would pay for expenses on behalf of the beneficiary if they're minor children. Some of the children here are adults. So to the extent they're adults they would make distribution.

THE COURT: So what's the resolution of the notary problem? Has that been resolved?

MR. SPALLINA: I can speak to it.

MR. MANCERI: Please, Robert, go ahead. The Judge is addressing you, be my guest.

MR. SPALLINA: In April of last year we
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THE COURT: No, I know that part.
MR. SPALLINA: Okay.
THE COURT: I mean everyone can see he signed these not notarized. When they were sent back to be notarized, the notary notarized them without him re-signing it, is that what happened?

MR. SPALLINA: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: So whatever issues arose with that, where are they today?

MR. SPALLINA: Today we have a signed affidavit from each of the children other than Mr. Bernstein that the original documents that were filed with The Court were in fact their original signatures which you have in the file attached as Exhibit A was the original document that was signed by them.

THE COURT: It was wrong for Moran to notarize -- so whatever Moran did, the documents that she notarized, everyone but

Eliot's side of the case have admitted that those are still the original signatures of either themselves or their father?

MR. SPALLINA: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I got it.
MR. MANCERI: And we can file those affidavits, Judge, at any time.

THE COURT: So now I'm trying to deal with the oral argument for today.

So I only have in front of me Shirley's estate. Shirley's estate is closed.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, could I bring you up to speed on one thing maybe you're not seeing on your docket.

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. MANCERI: We actually filed a motion to actually reopen the estate when we learned about the deficiency in the affidavit issue.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MANCERI: And that was signed
August 28th of this year. Do you have a copy of that, Judge, can I approach?

THE COURT: Hold on, it should be here, but let's see. Because I have an August 28th
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s file, I have that.

MR. MANCERI: You have that.
THE COURT: Motion to reopen the estate.
MR. MANCERI: Right, your Honor. We set it for an evidentiary hearing.

THE COURT: When is it set?
MR. MANCERI: It's set for October 28th,
your Honor, for an hour at 11:00 a.m.
THE COURT: I'm going to decide on Shirley's case whether to open it and how to deal with whatever issues pertain to this, but, Eliot, on your side you have an emergency motion to freeze assets of the estate, so I would say to you with a closed estate where the PR, Simon, has been already discharged, and a petition for discharge approved, what assets are there in a closed estate where the estate assets have already been distributed that I can now in your motion freeze?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The petition --
THE COURT: Listen to my question. It's artful. What assets now that the estate's been closed, that the estate's been fully administered, and the estate has been discharged, can I freeze that I could identify still belong to Shirley's estate?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I can't tell you because $I$ never got a document regarding the assets.

THE COURT: But when you say it's an emergency hearing --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But I was supposed to get those documents, correct?

THE COURT: Well, I don't know what documents --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I was a beneficiary, unlike they said, me, my brother was cut out of my mother's estate and my older sister.

THE COURT: They said you were a
beneficiary of personal property.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, I was the third beneficiary to the entire estate.

THE COURT: All right, I don't know.
MR. SPALLINA: At one point he was.
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MR. MANCERI: Early on, your Honor.
THE COURT: But on the will that was
probated?
MR. MANCERI: No.
THE COURT: Okay, so maybe you don't know then, your mother changed her will, they say.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Did my mother change
her will?
MR. SPALLINA: You know that your father did.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, he asked if my mother did.

MR. SPALLINA: Oh, yes.
THE COURT: Okay, all right --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: After she was dead using alleged --

THE COURT: Not after she was dead.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, your Honor, my father went back into my mother's estate and made changes after we believe he was dead using documents that are signed forged, by the way those documents you're looking at --

THE COURT: Here's the thing.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: You want me to freeze assets of an estate that's already been fully probated. I can't freeze something that doesn't exist.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can you reopen it because it was closed on fraudulent documents?

THE COURT: They asked for the estate to be reopened. They want to have a hearing on that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Do you have responses to your motion?

MR. MANCERI: Mr. Spallina filed it, but I don't believe so yet, your Honor.

THE COURT: So we know one person wants to reopen it, Eliot, correct? Who did you notice of that motion?

MR. MANCERI: This motion was served on Ted Bernstein, Pamela --

THE COURT: Ted, do you want the estate
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MR. THEODORE BERNSTEIN: I think you're asking me a legal question, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does anyone represent you?
MR. MANCERI: Not at the moment, your Honor. I may depending on how far this goes. THE COURT: All right, well, what I'm getting at is, is anyone opposing the reopening of the estate?

MR. MANCERI: No, your Honor. We want to open it to cure what his allegation is. THE COURT: First step, one, is reopen. MR. MANCERI: Correct.

THE COURT: So why do we have to wait until the end of October to reopen the estate when we could do that in mid-September?

MR. MANCERI: No reason, your Honor.
THE COURT: Any reason why we need to wait?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: All right, so...
MR. MANCERI: You haven't heard any objections to this from anybody else, have you Robert?

MR. SPALLINA: No.
THE COURT: All right, so get me up an agreed order that $I$ could open up the estate. MR. MANCERI: Okay, you'll take care of that, Robert?

MR. SPALLINA: Uh-Huh.
MR. MANCERI: We'll take the October hearing off your docket.

THE COURT: You don't need an evidentiary hearing to prove it, I'm going to do it, and under these circumstances that makes sense.

Okay, so I'm going to have it reopen the estate. So now the question is --

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, just so I'm
clear.
THE COURT: Yes, Shirley's estate.
MR. MANCERI: The reason we asked to reopen it is to cure or address this alleged fraud.

THE COURT: But all I'm physically doing

In Re_ The Estate of Shirley Bernstein.txt is saying, Rich, reopen.

MR. MANCERI: Agreed. I just wanted to be clear.

THE COURT: I don't want you to get rid of the hearing.

MR. MANCERI: Oh, you don't, okay.
THE COURT: So at the hearing whatever it is in relief that you want now that the estate is open, I'll hear that.

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Bernstein, whatever you want relief-wise to happen with respect to Shirley's estate, not Shirley's trust, but Shirley's estate, you could have a hearing on that. I'll combine everyone who has an interest in getting some relief.

MR. MANCERI: Only thing I was going to say, your Honor, after this was noticed I got into this matter. I have a conflict on the

28th at that hour. If we could move it to the afternoon I'd appreciate it.

THE COURT: I'll get my book and see. Maybe I can, I don't know.

MR. MANCERI: That's my only issue on the 28th.

THE COURT: I don't know, I'll look.
So let me try to make some progress, all right.

So today is whether in Shirley's estate there's an emergency, here is my order, no. Okay?

MR. MANCERI: Okay.
THE COURT: Next, whether -- what type of evidentiary hearing, if any, needs to be held. For Shirley's estate purposes I guess I have to figure out the following: It appears that there could be some problem in the documents that took place to lead Shirley's estate to be closed and distributed as it took place, okay because --

MR. MANCERI: Right.
THE COURT: It took place pursuant to documents that may have been improperly notarized. Now. That doesn't mean that
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MR. MANCERI: Judge, in furtherance in making that determination, would you like us to submit these to you?

THE COURT: What are those?
MR. MANCERI: These are the original
affidavits. I haven't made copies.
THE COURT: File them.
MR. MANCERI: Just file them, okay. Very good, we'll file them and serve them.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, I want you to understand something. Let's say you prove what seems perhaps to be easy, that Moran notarized your signature, your father's signature, other people's signatures after you signed it, and you signed it without the notary there and they signed it afterwards. That may be a wrongdoing on her part as far as her notary republic ability, but the question is, unless someone
claims and proves forgery, okay, forgery, proves forgery, the document will purport to be the document of the person who signs it, and then the question is, will something different happen in Shirley's estate then what was originally intended? Originally intended they say, the other side, was for Simon to close out the estate. The estate they say was small. The estate gave everything to the trust and that's what it did, and that was the end of the estate.

Remember, this is not everything about your parents and their estate planning. This is one small component, Shirley's estate alone, not her trust, and nothing to do with what happened with Simon, okay, because that's not before me. Simon's case is before Judge French.

Having said that, one of the other reasons why I have to consider whether your matter is an emergency, even if there was something that
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were not a beneficiary of the estate, so certainly you're not doing your groundwork to tell me if it's an emergency or not because it could be an emergency if you were a beneficiary of her will that was probated, but you don't even know one way or the other. So you could be a stranger to the estate. She may have disinherited you from the estate. She may have chosen to only give you personal property. So if you're not entitled to anything, you don't have an emergency. You're not entitled to anything. Go ahead.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I never was
noticed --
THE COURT: It doesn't matter.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- by the estate
planner when she died.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So he's supposed to
notify the beneficiaries.
THE COURT: Who?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Mr. Spallina.
THE COURT: Of what?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That there are
beneficiaries of the estate.

THE COURT: But what if you weren't a
beneficiary?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I was at that time. My dad doesn't change that until a year-and-a-half later. Are you following?

THE COURT: This may be about it, but
you're interested in some financial relief. If you don't want to go out and get a laborer job today to feed your children that's your choice.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't say that.
THE COURT: I'm not in charge of feeding your children or paying your electric bills, you are. You have to do what a parent does to take care of their children. It doesn't sound like you're doing everything that you can, but
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But in the meantime not knowing a whole lot about this case, it's my first time I'm really having this type of dialogue. I heard some voice that said there's cash to feed your children that could become readily in your pocket or in someone's pocket to pay bills that could help your children. I heard that. They say the stumbling block to your children getting the benefit of that money is you. I
don't know whether that's true or not, but if you want your children to imminently get money and they have imminent money to give your children, maybe you want to sit with Ted and that other side and see if there's some money that could come to your children.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Excuse me.
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's like asking me to participate in what I allege is a fraud.

THE COURT: No, it doesn't --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Listen, if the money comes to my children and it was supposed to have gone to me, and these documents that are all shady and unsigned wills with --un-notarized wills and trusts don't stand. The money comes to me personally, Eliot Bernstein.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor --
THE COURT: Let me just say this to you. Maybe two, three years from now as a result of the same trust litigation you'll be right, but in the meantime according to you there's money that could feed your children that you don't want to touch because you think the money should go to you instead of your children that
they're willing to --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I think there are other beneficiaries.

THE COURT: -- put in accounts to go for the benefit of your children.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I think there are
other beneficiaries that are also --
THE COURT: They signed off.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, just their
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THE COURT: Well, the parents represent the child.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, but they have conflicting interests.

THE COURT: Well, you say that --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Our attorney wrote a subpoena and said it. I had to get two lawyers because my attorney couldn't represent both sides of this.

MR. MANCERI: I'm very concerned about something Mr. Bernstein just told The Court. He's the one objecting they're in conflict, he's stating from what I'm piecing together that he believes that his children are getting
money that the parents really was supposed to go to him personally. He's got the inherent conflict with that mindset.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not saying I don't.

THE COURT: Okay, here's the point, if you're at a point where you're asking The Court for an emergency because you can't feed children, and there's someone around the corner that's holding out a $\$ 20$ bill and says you could have it to feed your children, and you go, you know, I'm not going to take that to feed my children because I want to have a court determine that it really was mine, then I don't know that you're treating this as an emergency. Emergencies mean you figure out a way of getting the money to your children sooner than later, and they say it's happening imminently, cash that could pay bills for your children. That's what they say. If it's an emergency and your kids are starving, and you as the parent say that might be my money and not my kids', so I want to wait for two or three years and let the money stay in a bank account until I could figure it out, and not feed my children, I
think you need to reflect upon some of your decisions.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor --
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THE COURT: What?
MR. MANCERI: I'm not saying we're going to do this, Judge, but this sounds like this may need an ad litem for these kids.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know, let's not add fuel to the fire.

MR. MANCERI: Because I'm troubled by what
he's saying.
THE COURT: All right, so --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's why I have not taken that money.

THE COURT: Why?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Because if you told me, your Honor, that you just murdered him, and here's $\$ 20$ from his pocket to feed your kids from the crime --

THE COURT: If they were starving I would take the $\$ 20$.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On that advice, I'll
take the money.
THE COURT: If they were starving --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On that advice --

THE COURT: Your kids are starving. I'm not giving you advice.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On that advice, I will --

THE COURT: The $\$ 20$ didn't murder anybody, did it? Did the $\$ 20$-bill murder someone?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's stealing money from people.

THE COURT: They're not -- this isn't stolen money. This is your parents' money.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If I take that money and put it in my kids' accounts, it's actually taking money from what we believe are the true and proper beneficiaries --

THE COURT: Which is you.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, through -- one of, through --

THE COURT: So meanwhile if your kids are starving and you don't take the money, all I could say to you, there's obviously -- if you look at the documents I mean you're not going to confess to killing Kennedy as part of receiving the money, but if they want to give you money for your children and you don't want
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you want to wait years --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's not why I
want to dispute it.
THE COURT: You think that there's some --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I think that it's
part of a fraud that forged documents were used to --

THE COURT: But it's still your parents
money --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- convert estate
assets to the wrong beneficiary.
THE COURT: But they want to now get it to
you.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, not me.
THE COURT: To your children.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Listen, I'll take the money without explanation on it. I agree. Listen, the only reason $I$ didn't want to take the money was so $I$ wouldn't be part of a fraud.

THE COURT: You're not, obviously no one is accusing you of fraud. If they give you money to care for --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But then I could accuse them of fraud if I'm participating. THE COURT: I mean all you're doing is
signing a receipt. You don't know where the money came from. You're not signing off -you're not saying that you make a declaration that the money came from them, the other side to you in only legal means. You're just signing a receipt.

MR. MANCERI: But he is signing off on that he's going to honor the terms of the trust. If he is signing off to that --

THE COURT: If it comes to you as trustee for your children, you are -- you have a duty to only use it for the children, not yourself. Not you. You still have to work for you. Now, you don't have to work for your children, maybe. You still have to support yourself.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: The money has to get spent on your children if that's how you get it.
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MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Right.
THE COURT: That's all we're talking about is money to feed your children.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You see, if the money came to me, it's also for me and my wife and feeds our children. THE COURT: That's not what they said. It
does not go to support you and your wife. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If the money comes to me as a beneficiary, it does. If all these nonsense documents that are forged and -THE COURT: If they want to give it to you only under their condition this is because their version is it belongs to your children. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Right. THE COURT: Don't accept it, you don't get it. If you accept it, it goes to your children. You may not like that, but it only could be used for your children, because that's the deal that they make. You take that deal because you don't want your kids to starve. You may not like it, you want to be supported too, but they don't want to support you. They don't think it's your money, they think it's your children's money. So why turn that -- maybe you're entitled to it, but why turn down money that could help support your children in the meantime.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If your logic is correct, your Honor, I agree.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know if my logic is correct.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's the legal problem --

THE COURT: Stop, no, the hearing is over. I'm not giving more legal advice. Your hearing goes on, okay, see you.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, any chance of resetting it?

THE COURT: I'm going to ask my office to flip it around to the afternoon. I'll take care of that.

MR. MANCERI: Thank you, your Honor. We'll submit an order to your Honor.
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THE COURT: Okay, clear it with him and see if you could actually get something that makes sense. It's really narrow.

MR. MANCERI: It's very narrow. We've got the transcript, Judge.

THE COURT: It's only really that there's no emergency here. Everything everyone raises on the 28th.

MR. MANCERI: Very good, Judge. Do you think we can do it in an hour, Judge?

THE COURT: We'll try.
MR. MANCERI: Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry, your

```
Honor, for calling an emergency.
    THE COURT: All right. Just there's a lot
        of work when you call something an emergency.
            MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't understand
        what you go through.
            THE COURT: Okay, bye.
            MR. MANCERI: It's an evidentiary, Judge,
        we're going to call witnesses.
            THE COURT: Witnesses and evidence.
            MR. MANCERI: Very good.
(The proceeding was concluded at 2:15 p.m.)
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THE COURT: All right. Good Afternoon. Judge Colin. 2011CP000653. The Estate of Shirley Bernstein. Can everyone make their appearances.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein.
MR. MANCERI: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mark Manceri. I'm here on behalf of Ted Bernstein as successor personal representative of the Estate of Shirley Bernstein, and I'm here on behalf of Donald Tescher and Robert Spallina.

MR. PRATT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Brandan Pratt appearing on behalf of Eliot Bernstein, and I also have with me here today Eliot Bernstein and his wife, Candace Bernstein.

THE COURT: Okay. So this was a hearing that was set pursuant to an order of September 24, 2013, that order being an order on notice on emergency motion to freeze assets, and it says the purpose of this hearing is to address any alleged improprieties or defects in the form of pleadings or other documents submitted to the Court in furtherance of the Estate of Shirley Bernstein which was previously closed.

MR. PRATT: Your Honor, I'd like to evoke the rule of sequestration.

THE COURT: Hold on. I'll be right with you. Okay. All right. The rule was evoked. Are there any witnesses on either side that are not parties that are going to testify? Please stand up.

MR. PRATT: Non parties, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Parties are allowed to stay.
MR. PRATT: I believe Mr. Tescher and Mr. Spallina are non parties to the estate proceedings.

MR. MANCERI: No. They have been named by your client.

THE COURT: They're in the heading of the adversary proceeding.

Okay, what's your name, ma'am?
MS. MORAN: Kimberly Moran.
THE COURT: So Kimberly, you may or may not be called as a witness. You need to wait outside. You can't allow anyone to discuss their testimony in your presence, or you participate in that as well. If someone violates what \(I\) just said, find my bailiff, let me know, and we'll deal with them.

MR. ROTH: Just to let you know, Your Honor, David Roth on behalf of Ms. Moran.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Moran, that lady that's just leaving?

MR. ROTH: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Just for my benefit, the lawyers can tell me, Ms. Moran is employee of --

MR. MANCERI: Tescher \& Spallina, P.A.
THE COURT: I remember that. I've got it. So it sounds like, Mr. Pratt, I think probably from an orderly fashion, since I reserved this time for you to raise on behalf of your client some irregularities that we spoke about, I think you're up.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, if \(I\) might, just to refresh your memory, we had filed a motion to reopen the estate. Tescher \& Spallina had filed a motion to reopen. Mr. Eliot Bernstein was on here on his emergency motion that was denied; that's what he filed.

THE COURT: I said there was no -- so the order I have is the order on the emergency
motion to freeze assets. I said there's no emergency.

MR. MANCERI: Correct.
THE COURT: But I announced what the purpose of the hearing was.

MR. MANCERI: Yes. You did. It's embodied of the order, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So you want to go forward to address irregularities in the pleadings that Eliot says exist.

MR. MANCERI: I believe that's the way we left it.

MR. PRATT: Your Honor, I disagree in that he filed a motion to reopen the estate, an agreed order --

THE COURT: I reopened it. That's not an issue. So whose pleadings are filed that are challenging the propriety of the pleadings?

MR. MANCERI: That would be Mr. Bernstein. He filed it, but he filed it as part of the emergency motion.

THE COURT: I understand. I'm not hearing -- I'm not sure what you're getting at Mr. Manceri, so what is it that you're seeking to do?

MR. MANCERI: I'm just addressing the order Judge, that you announced, that's all I'm addressing.

THE COURT: Paragraph three of the September \(24 t h\) order, it says the purpose of today's hearing is to address any alleged impropriety or defect in the form of the pleadings or other documents submitted to the court in furtherance of the closing of the Estate of Shirley Bernstein.

MR. MANCERI: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: The person who filed the request to, or who raised an allegation of impropriety, was who?

MR. MANCERI: Actually, it's my position that Mr. Tescher or Mr. Spallina raised it voluntarily in their petition to reopen. While you did reopen it, they were the one's who actually brought the issue forward.

THE COURT: But I see their August 28th motion, \(I\) reopened the estate, so they said that they thought they wanted to give, using their words, persons the opportunity to cure the irregularities. Someone needs to formally identify the irregularities, unless you
stipulate what those are.
MR. MANCERI: There's no written stipulation as to that.

THE COURT: So to do this in an orderly way, which is all I'm getting at, you think that you -- if \(I\) let you go first on your side, Mr. Manceri, what irregularities, if any, are you going to point out took place?

MR. MANCERI: We're going to point out, take you through the issue of the submittance of the original waivers which were returned by the clerk, because of your method of doing that, that required notarization, and then take you through the affirmation of those original waivers with current affidavits from the beneficiary reaffirming that they, in fact, acknowledge the original waivers which were not notarized with current addresses, with original affidavits attached to them, and we would walk the Court through that exercise.

THE COURT: Stop there. What do you want to tell me, Mr. Pratt, as to why you should go first?

MR. PRATT: I think that whole thing was brought about by the fact that my client,

Eliot Bernstein, in fact filed the emergency motion. As far --

THE COURT: That gets your nowhere. So we're long passed that point.

MR. PRATT: Number two, that they were seeking to reopen the estate. The estate was already reopened, and \(I\) don't know why they would be challenging the documents that they used to close the estate, but for Mr. Bernstein here filing his emergency motion in which although it was titled emergency, it bought up all of these issues that we're currently here before this Court. It was only after he filed the motion in which he was contesting the validity of the waivers that this Court -- that they ended up filing their motion to reopen the estate. I wasn't --

THE COURT: So what benefit is there to this process for you to go first? Both sides are going to go. We're only talking about who's going first.

MR. PRATT: First off, he's the petitioner. I don't know that they're going to necessarily address all of the issues that we're going to bring up.

THE COURT: So listen carefully. Mr. Pratt goes first.

MR. MANCERI: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: That way we can move along. Go ahead.

MR. PRATT: All right. I just brought some legal authority here that I'd like to point out. May I approach, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Sure. I'll look at that at the right time.

MR. PRATT: I'm going to give a brief opening statement before \(I\) call my first witness, just to give an overview of why we want the estate, \(I\) guess, to remain open, rather than being closed. I'm kind of a latecomer to the case, but I realize that's kind of the issue here.

THE COURT: That would be helpful. Tell me what the issue is; that's true.

MR. PRATT: This issue is, as far I understand it, whether or not the estate will remain open. Although there was an order that reopened the estate, my understanding essentially is the personal representative essentially wants at this hearing to re-close
the estate.
THE COURT: Based upon the most recent waivers of accountings, petition for discharge, and the pleadings filed October 23rd; is that correct?

MR. MANCERI: It's not exactly correct, Your Honor. We have no petition for discharge filed at the moment. The order specifically addresses what you're going to hear today, we had this whole thrust in parity if you remember at the end of the last hearing with Mr. Bernstein who was without counsel at the time, that's why the order pursuant to your ruling is crafted the way it's crafted. It's a limited issue. You told Mr. Bernstein we're not going to be discussing the Shirley Bernstein Trust and all the distributions. We went through this whole anemic experience. You went through that whole thing.

THE COURT: So the issue is, is the estate going to remain open, or be closed, but there's no petition for discharge to close it, I'm told.

MR. PRATT: Or essentially address the validity of the waivers. If all of the beneficiaries have signed off on it, and we contend that they haven't, it would be a foregone conclusion that the estate would then be closed.

THE COURT: So who are the beneficiaries that have to sign off?

MR. PRATT: Well, I mean that's one of the issues, because --

THE COURT: From your point of view, who are the beneficiaries?

MR. PRATT: Our point of view is the beneficiaries that need to sign off would be one of the decedents, essentially.

THE COURT: Who?
MR. ATTY: One of the decedents, Simon Bernstein, and then also potentially Eliot, three of Simon and Shirley's children, Eliot, Lisa and Jill, and if they contend there was a --

THE COURT: Just who do you say that -- who are the people that need to sign off? Simon, Eliot, Lisa, Jill.

MR. PRATT: Yea. If they contend there was
a valid power of appointment executed before the estate was closed, then there would be a total of six grandchildren that would have to sign the waivers in some sort of capacity. If they were minors, then they would have to have that parents sign waivers, that sort of capacity, or an administrator ad litem. THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. PRATT: There is also some issue whether or not the power of appointment expanded to include for additional grandchildren. Some of those grandchildren are over the age of 18 , and if they contend that there was a power of appointment that was validly executed, which I believe that's the position they're taking, that would also include waivers by four additional grandchildren, Eric, Michael, Eliot, and Molly, and there would have been no documents or waivers signed by any grandchildren, that have been filed in this case.

And as far as that's concerned, Eliot's waiver was invalidly executed. The reasons why it was essentially, as shown in the Sustrassen case, there has to be an intentional relinquishment of the right. The evidence that we're going to present is going to show that he signed the waiver, but in conjunction with him signing the waiver he was always under the impression he would still get financial information associated with the estate. They sent him the waiver without any financial information. He sent it back. He sent it along with an e-mail saying, I'm still going to get all this financial information. There's a series of e-mail's spanning throughout the next year, e-mail's and letters from Mr. Bernstein's prior counsel, in which he requested the information. And then as far as Eliot Bernstein's waiver is concerned, this court should not consider that to be valid. Also, many of the waivers have been forged. I think the Court might recall from the last hearing there was a series of waivers that had been forged, that occurred after the prior personal representative had, in fact, died, and so that's another impropriety that we are going to present evidence on.

THE COURT: Okay. Then so if I find that Eliot's waiver was invalidated, you want the estate to remain open. MR. PRATT: Exactly.

THE COURT: And then do what?
MR. PRATT: We want to receive the financial information that he's been requesting since the estate was opened. He didn't even find out he was a beneficiary until the time he received the waiver, and essentially we want to receive financial information and want a proper estate accounting, and if everything is as they say it is, then the estate will be closed after the production of various documents and a final accounting if we need to have a final accounting.

THE COURT: So if you prove that there were prior waivers that had been forged, what does that do?

MR. PRATT: Well, as far as the forgery goes, those are going to be invalid.

THE COURT: I'm told now that those same individuals, and Mr. Manceri correct me if I'm wrong, have now filled out and sent in new waivers.

MR. MANCERI: Not only that, Judge, they have already been filed.

THE COURT: That's what I mean; otherwise,

I would not have them in the file.
MR. PRATT: Yea. As far as those waivers go, that's fine except for two important points. One is that Simon Bernstein's waiver, which was one of them that was forged, he's deceased, so obviously he could not have signed that waiver, so without some waiver or something from the personal representative of his estate, it wouldn't be able to close, and then in addition to that although there are several children that have reaffirmed their waivers, it would not apply to all of the grandchildren who don't have any waivers on file.

THE COURT: So let's put aside for a moment that Eliot's saying \(I\) don't want my waiver recognized, I want financial information, I may want an accounting, and see what goes from there, you only represent him, Eliot; correct?

MR. PRATT: That's right.
THE COURT: Is Simon represented here, or anyone, since Simon's deceased, anyone on his behalf here for him?

MR. PRATT: There was an order that appointed Ted as the personal representative of his estate when it was reopened.

THE COURT: Is he, Ted Bernstein, PR of Simon Bernstein, complaining about any aspect of Shirley Bernstein's estate, including your position that his, Simon's wavier may have been improper?

MR. PRATT: I'm unaware of any complaints he made. We questioned whether or not he has a conflict of interest, whether or not he is a co-defendant, in which they then allege that millions of dollars have been taken, and there is an association with the estate, and we think there is a conflict with his estate in the sense that Ted may have absconded with millions of dollars without Sy's knowledge, and therefore they may have a conflict of interest in that respect.

THE COURT: I would deal with that in something filed in Simon's estate. We're limited only to Shirley's estate here.

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: And the fact that the other individuals who supposedly had their waivers executed improperly, who now may have tried to cure them, they're not seeking any further
relief from Shirley's estate; is that true?
MR. PRATT: I believe Eliot is the only one who is seeking to have documents produced and have a financial accounting issued.

THE COURT: So from a practical point of view, which we always have to keep our eye on the ball, is there any reason -- I know from the last hearing that there was a lot about the alleged impropriety of the prior waivers, but now that you have summarized the issues as you have, is there any reason why, today, I would go beyond, now that \(I\) have opened Shirley's estate and I am entering an order dealing with Shirley's estate, I wouldn't focus in on the issue whether Eliot has waived as a beneficiary whatever rights purportedly he had waived, and if \(I\) say no waiver, what to do about it. Is that the only area that Eliot could get some relief from?

MR. PRATT: That and whether or not this court believes that the grandchildren would have also had to sign waivers in order to have the estate closed.

THE COURT: The grand children of who?
MR. PRATT: The grandchildren of Shirley

Bernstein's estate.
THE COURT: But her children, the parents of those grandchildren are the one's who signed the waivers?

MR. PRATT: Yea. But they signed essentially, and there was no statement in there that they were signing on behalf of their children. And in addition, there's a contention that some of the grandchildren are beyond the age of 18 , so it would not be any sort of natural guardianship that would occur.

THE COURT: So what's Eliot's standing to deal with that?

MR. PRATT: What's his standing to deal with that? The alleged --

THE COURT: The alleged issue that grandchildren may or may not be participating in this proceeding.

MR. PRATT: As far as whether or not the estate was properly closed or not.

THE COURT: Even though he may have no financial interest in where that issue may go?

MR. PRATT: He does have a financial interest in it.

THE COURT: How is that an interest?

MR. PRATT: Because that would change the way the estate was distributed.

THE COURT: Okay. How?
MR. PRATT: Shirley's will devises her assets to three of her five children. It actually devises it to a trust, which provides for her husband, which ultimately is supposed to go to three of her five children. There was a power of appointment in association with one or more of those trusts that gave her husband, Simon, the ability to potentially change the beneficiaries, but it was a limited power of appointment, and I think a question exists of, one, whether that document was validly executed or not, and two, did that document go above and beyond what was required or what was allowed, because there's a definition section underneath Shirley's trust that says she defines her children as Eliot, Lisa, and Jill, and specifically says for purposes of this trust Ted and Pam shall be treated as predeceased, and all their children should be treated as predeceased. So if there is a determination or some sort of distribution in which now they're telling Eliot that he is a beneficiary, and now all the sudden he isn't a beneficiary of the estate --

THE COURT: You already made your point. We will deal with whether Eliot is a beneficiary, whether he's had a valid wavier, I've got that part down, but the question is are there any other issues I need to deal with today.

MR. PRATT: That \(I\) think is the primary issue, but also the issue of whether certain people are considered beneficiaries of the estate.

THE COURT: For Eliot to raise that, he has to be an interested person in the outcome of that proceeding.

MR. PRATT: He is.
THE COURT: How is he affected by whether the grandchildren are deemed to be beneficiaries or not?

MR. PRATT: Because if -- it's kind of a two-stage analysis. If the grandchildren aren't beneficiaries, then he is not a beneficiary. Then the second phase of that is whether or not if the power of appointment was
validly executed, then the question becomes are his children entitled to half of the estate, or are they entitled to three-tenths of the estate.

THE COURT: Okay. Tell me what the will says.

MR. PRATT: The will devices everything to a trust.

THE COURT: So they disagree with that. The will should say what it says, there shouldn't be too much dispute about that. Are you comfortable you know what it says, because as soon as you said that --

MR. PRATT: I welcome to hear their interpretation.

THE COURT: Mr. Manceri, discipline yourself right now and only tell me that you can participate if you can answer my questions. I don't want advocacy now. Tell me what the will says.

MR. MANCERI: The will says that all the tangible personal property goes to Simon, who survived his wife, Shirley, and the residue goes into what's known as an existing trust, trust which we will call the Shirley Bernstein

Trust for purposes of the hearing.
MR. PRATT: I agree with that.
THE COURT: So at the end of the day of this estate litigation is there a contest that that's the provisions of the will? You said that you agree.

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: So whatever Shirley had available to devise personalty to Simon, who's deceased and we can maybe deal with that in his estate, everything else to Shirley's trust.

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: So this order limited us to Shirley's estate, not to her trust. We were pretty clear. Maybe I'm just confused.

MR. PRATT: That's the financial. The analysis goes a little bit deeper than that, because --

THE COURT: If Shirley's assets, other than the personalty goes to her trust, none of the children are the beneficiaries, or grandchildren are the beneficiaries under Shirley's will. Her trust is; correct?

MR. PRATT: That's right, but --

THE COURT: Once the trust receives whatever assets there are, the provisions of the trust will rise and fall on who gets what; is that true, or not?

MR. PRATT: Pretty much.
THE COURT: So his waiver, going back, was the waiver a waiver that said to Eliot waive whatever interest you may have in Shirley's estate?

MR. PRATT: No. It was just a waiver of a financial accounting and service of a petition for discharge, just the normal estate closing waiver. That's all it was.

THE COURT: It sounds like though that on the estate level of Shirley this is really a simple matter. Is there something that I'm missing, on the estate level? You know, I mean one thing we learned here is we pick the manner in which we do our battles. It sounds like on the estate level Shirley's probate estate is simple. Simon gets her personalty, and her trust gets everything else. What could be more simple than that?

MR. PRATT: I would agree that it is simple.

THE COURT: Okay. So you may have some litigation, some action pending in her trust case. Is there?

MR. PRATT: There is no trust case, right now, and \(I\) just want to point out a couple of things as far as the trust code is concerned, and these are some of the statutes and court rules that I've handed you. Florida probate 5.240 basically says, if you have a situation where the personal representative of an estate is the same, it says a pour over will type of situation pours all the assets into the trust, and that trustee is the same, the qualified beneficiaries of the trust are considered interested parties for the estate proceedings.

THE COURT: Let's assume I make everybody interested, you're still telling me that the command of the estate is --

MR. PRATT: We just want to know. THE COURT: -- to pour over everything to the trust. Let me read between the lines here. I don't know what the trust says. I'm not asking about that. Is the issue whether the \(P R\) of the estate -- and who's the \(P R\), Ted? MR. PRATT: Yes. Currently.

THE COURT: Whether he is carrying out Shirley's mandate by transferring all of Shirley's assets to the trust; is that an issue?

MR. PRATT: I think that's it. We want to know how much was in her estate, and we want simple information related to the estate administration. The estate inventory said there was \(\$ 25,000\). Eliot Bernstein believes they were worth millions of dollars, and there could have been assets entitled to the trust, but this is part of a bigger picture. We want to see what happened in the estate, so that we can make sure everything got properly transferred over to the trust.

THE COURT: Tell me what the provisions of the trust say. Do you know?

MR. PRATT: I know what the provisions of the trust say. Essentially there is a trust that provides for the benefit of her husband while he is alive, and then upon her death the assets are supposed to be distributed to three of her five children.

THE COURT: Who?
MR. PRATT: Eliot, Lisa, and Jill. Now,
there was also a power of appointment that was -- I guess the trust also contained provisions that said for the purposes of the trust two of her five children, Ted and Pam, should be treated as predeceased. And then there is a power of appointment that's named in Simon's will that says I want to appoint all of this money to all of his grandchildren, which is a little bit different from the provisions that were in Shirley's document. THE COURT: So I'm just lost in one area, because you mentioned Simon's will, so how does Simon's will get involved?

MR. PRATT: Simon's will gets involved because Shirley gave him a power of appointment, a limited power of appointment, to change the beneficiaries.

THE COURT: In the trust.
MR. PRATT: Exactly.
THE COURT: So Simon during his lifetime could or not execute the power of appointment. MR. PRATT: Exactly. THE COURT: Did he? MR. PRATT: There is a power of appointment that exists in his will.

THE COURT: But you can exercise a power of appointment in a will, so when he dies, as part of his will he's saying here's how \(I\) want to exercise the power of appointment that Shirley gave me.

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: That only manifests itself because he survived her. What does he do with that power of appointment.

MR. PRATT: As far as we understand, he attempts to name -- he says it goes to all my grandchildren, so there's 10 of them.

THE COURT: So bypassing, Eliot, Lisa, and Jill.

MR. PRATT: And Ted and Pam.
THE COURT: Ted and Pam already out. So the five children are out, and the 10 grandchildren are in.

MR. PRATT: Exactly. There's a question whether that power of appointment was used more broadly than was given to him.

THE COURT: So in what case does that get litigated?

MR. PRATT: That would not be in this case. That would have to be in a case involving his
estate, or likely his trust, or maybe a case that was against his trust and then put into his estate. We don't even know if that happened.

THE COURT: So let's get back to Shirley's estate.

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: So it sounds like Eliot may be, either him or his children if the power of appointment was executed, a beneficiary of Shirley's trust. I'm working backwards. So he wants to get information to make sure that what Shirley owned at the time, or had an ownership interest in at the time of her death was transferred properly through her will and poured over into her trust; is that what he wants?

MR. PRATT: Yes.
THE COURT: Is that something that he is legally entitled to?

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, it's our contention he is not legally entitled to it, because he did a full waiver of every interest in the estate.

THE COURT: But for the waiver, he wouldn't be interested. Would he be allowed to that information?

MR. MANCERI: His children would technically be interested. None of the children are beneficiaries, as you correctly stated, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The trust is the beneficiary. You mean of the trust.

MR. MANCERI: That's correct.
THE COURT: Because a power of appointment was executed.

MR. MANCERI: Right. By Simon to all the grandchildren.

THE COURT: But I'm trying to get passed some of the things that have to be ultimately litigated in some other forum. Are we down to whether the waiver was validly executed or not?

MR. MANCERI: I think that's the bulk of it, certainly, Your Honor, yes, whether the waiver was validly executed.

THE COURT: If the waiver was not validly executed, what Mr. Pratt is saying is he wants financial information that may include an accounting so he can determine, he, Eliot,
that what Ted as PR transferred over from Shirley's estate poured over into her trust is what should have gone.

MR. MANCERI: An accounting of the probate estate he's talking about.

THE COURT: The probate estate.
MR. MANCERI: Right. I think he can theoretically arguably ask for that, Your Honor, on behalf of his children.

THE COURT: I know you attacked the waiver, and you say it was valid. He says it's not. What's the harm by giving him the information, the financial disclosure of what Shirley's estate poured over into the trust.

MR. MANCERI: Simply, Your Honor, that he signed the waiver and we think this is all done and behind us. If he wants to proceed about a trust accounting he could get that same information in the trust arena by asking on the receipt side.

THE COURT: Every time this happens in a trust case everyone says there's some bar, but you didn't ask for it or get it in the estate case. That's the experience I get when that happens.

MR. MANCERI: We would certainly like -THE COURT: So in Shirley's estate, was there an inventory done?

MR. MANCERI: I presume there is.
MR. PRATT: There was.
MR. MANCERI: You can tell you, Your Honor, I want to clarify, and you asked me not to be an advocate, but there are a couple of facts I want to clear up. The co-personal representatives of Simon's estate are Mr . Spallina and Mr. Tescher, not Ted Bernstein. Judge French has Simon Bernstein's estate, in case you weren't aware of that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MANCERI: To go back --
THE COURT: I'm happy. That's good. Let someone else do it.

MR. MANCERI: We brought that up at the last hearing, but \(I\) don't know if you recall that or not, Judge. We would like to address the waiver. Yes, there was an accounting done. I don't know if we have the inventory. It certainly would be in the file if it was done. I don't have a copy handy.

THE COURT: Even if he did a waiver, I can still give him the inventory. I can open it. I can get it to him.

MR. PRATT: We have the inventory. MR. MANCERI: They have the inventory. MR. PRATT: We received the inventory after the estate was closed.

THE COURT: You got the inventory. Was there an accounting in the estate of Shirley Bernstein?

MR. MANCERI: If it was waived, Your Honor, that's the point.

THE COURT: All right. So what are the other financial documents other than the inventory that Eliot wants, Mr Pratt?

MR. MANCERI: Judge, if I might, the inventory listed \(\$ 25,000\) of tangible personal property, which all went to Mr. Bernstein as surviving spouse.

THE COURT: Okay. And that's it.
MR. MANCERI: That's it.
THE COURT: So according to the inventory there were no assets poured over from Shirley's estate into the trust.

MR. MANCERI: It was all funded pre-death. That's my understanding, Your Honor.

MR. PRATT: I mean, we don't have any documents to support that verification. We don't know how the attorneys have been paid, and we don't have any verification they were the only assets that were in there. Plus -THE COURT: The inventory is a verified document.

MR. PRATT: Right.
THE COURT: So that's -- so you have an inventory that says personalty only, and I could look it up. It's sealed. I can get it, but you have it already. If that's what it says, then Ted as \(P R\) is saying that's what \(I\) turned over as \(P R\), and so Simon got the personalty.

MR. MANCERI: Simon was the \(P R\) at that time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: He took it, that's right, because Ted got appointed when Simon died, and then nothing then is passing through the will, and Mr. Manceri just said to the extent to which Shirley's trust may have assets, it was funded pre-death, which happens, and there is no document in the estate that's going to verify that.

MR. PRATT: I mean if that's truly the case, then why not just produce an accounting? THE COURT: He's saying that's the case. Other than the lawyers saying that, I don't know. He's saying that was done, but more importantly Mr. Eliot can maybe do whatever he wants to do in the trust case to see what went into the trust, and that would be what Mr. Manceri is describing as the pre-death funding. But for purposes of Shirley's estate trying to put things in a step-by-step process, if her will says what it said, the inventory says no assets other than personalty of Shirley that went to Simon -- I mean, I'm here to determine should the estate be closed and then go to Judge French, have a good time. What else is there really to accomplish, even though we may have had a problem with the waivers, I understand that, but now they've reaffirmed them, so to -- I mean to spank somebody that may deserve to get spanked for doing something wrong, how does that put dollars, or benefits, in Eliot's pocket?

MR. PRATT: I guess part of it is the fact that there hadn't been really any information provided all along. He never really got any information until the estate was actually closed, so I mean that's part of his reasoning for wanting to reopen the estate and get the financial information. I think --

THE COURT: The answer is none. There is no estate, they're representing. I can put Ted under oath let you question him, but the issue is, which I'll do, whether there are any assets other than what's reflected on the inventory, and he'll say, I assume, based on what Mr. Manceri just told me, he'll say no. And so you can't produce financial documents on things that don't exist to the matter that we're speaking about.

MR. PRATT: I agree, but there could be an accounting that was produced.

THE COURT: You're not going to produce an accounting of nothing, and the purpose of an accounting is to get some verification that what was processed through the PR's hands is accurate. He'll testify in a moment just what Mr. Manceri probably told us, that the answer is nothing.

MR. PRATT: Okay.

THE COURT: So how does that --
MR. PRATT: I agree if what their representations are true it's possible we could receive some financial information. THE COURT: Other than -- I mean, you got the inventory. That shows basically that there are no estate assets other than personalty, which \(I\) assume is not an issue here. So today I'm not going to have them draw up an accounting that says nothing, because that doesn't do any good. Do you agree? Who's that going to benefit if he goes through the process of actually filing an accounting that says what the inventory says, personalty and nothing else.

MR. PRATT: Can we take a short break?
THE COURT: Absolutely. Sure. Go ahead.
(Thereupon, a short recess was taken.)
THE COURT: What did he say?
MR. PRATT: Your Honor, my client questions the accuracy of the inventory and would like the ability to utilize the estate proceedings to verify it's accuracy.

THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that he challenges that, but you haven't told me what basis he challenges that on.

MR. PRATT: Well, by virtue of the fact he believes his mother and father were worth millions and millions of dollars, yet the inventory of the estate contains only for \(\$ 25,000\).

THE COURT: But we heard Mr. Manceri tell us that Shirley transferred, during her lifetime, assets to her trust. You heard that as well. Plus, \(I\) know nothing about what Simon did with his estate, and Simon, he may have owned assets jointly and passed outside the estate. So the inventory is a narrow window of just that which passes through. There are people, and I'll say this to Eliot, we deal with this all the time, people sometimes are super rich and they don't even have a probate estate, because everything is titled jointly, or they fund the trust in advance, and there is no probate. People don't like to have probate. So that very well is what happened, but I'm willing to at least start. I want you to put on your client and take some testimony, because we had accuracy issues, Mr. Manceri, on the accuracy of the
inventory, and then to state on the record what he knows about, that he's done a search for other assets but personalty, and there's nothing else that Shirley had in her probate estate to be poured over into her trust. That is what you were told.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor, I like to put on two people.

THE COURT: You might want that, but \(I\) tell you what I want. I want the \(P R\) to do that first, and then we see.

MR. MANCERI: Judge, I wasn't prepared to address the inventory. I don't have a copy of the inventory at my disposal. If anybody has a copy, I'll be glad to use that. Just to be clear, Ted was not the \(P R\) at the time this inventory was filed.

THE COURT: But he's in charge of the estate once he takes it over.

MR. MANCERI: He just got appointed a couple of weeks ago, but yes.

THE COURT: He'll address it, otherwise I have to give him more time to do his work and not close the estate. You want the estate closed; right?

MR. MANCERI: We want to address what the court order said. We don't have a petition of discharge filed.

THE COURT: You want to file one to close the estate.

MR. MANCERI: Eventually, yes.
THE COURT: Come on up Ted.
MR. MANCERI: Mr. Bernstein, please. Judge, I'm still waiting for the inventory.

THE COURT: He'll give it to you. Do you have it? I mean, I have it. Do you have it Mr. Pratt?

MR. PRATT: I don't think so.
(A brief pause.)
THE COURT: Hold on. I'll get you a copy.
(A brief pause.)
THE COURT: I have a question, Mr. Manceri.
I want to make sure of one thing, the inventory was signed by Simon on August 29, 2011. When did he die?

MR. MANCERI: Simon died a little more than a year ago.

THE COURT: He was alive then.
MR. MANCERI: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right.

MR. MANCERI: I think September, 2012 he died --

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MANCERI: -- if my memory serves me correctly. And Mrs. Bernstein died the prior December. 2010, forgive me.

THE COURT: There is a petition for discharge on file.

MR. MANCERI: That's the original petition. That was probably for Simon. Now we have to do one for Ted, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.
Whereupon Mr. Ted Bernstein was sworn in by
The Court.)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MANCERI:
Q. State your name for the record, please.
A. Ted Bernstein.
Q. Mr. Bernstein, are you one of the children of Shirley and Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes. I am.
Q. Do you have any siblings?
A. Yes. I do.
Q. What are their names?
A. Pam, Simon, Eliot Bernstein, Jill and Lisa.
Q. Are you aware of the fact that your father, Simon, was the named personal representative of your mother, Shirley's estate?
A. I am, yes.
Q. Did you have hands-on working participation as far as the administration of your mother's estate, with your father?
A. Did not.
Q. I'm going to show you a document which the court bailiff has given us, which is entitled, "Inventory." Are you familiar with your father's signature?
A. I am.
Q. Take a look at this document on page two, and tell me if that's your father's signature, to the best of your knowledge.
A. Yes. It is.
Q. Are you familiar with a gentleman named Robert Spallina?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you know that name, and how is it familiar to you?
A. He is the personal representative of my father's estate.
Q. Do you know whether or not he was one of the attorneys that handled the administration of your
mother's estate?
A. I believe he was, yes.
Q. This inventory reflects, and these are assets that would be in your mother's individual name, not in her trust, not in her joint name, not with a beneficiary named on them, of an estimated value of \(\$ 25,000\) described as furniture, furnishings, household goods and personal effects, do you see that?
A. I see that.
Q. Do you have any personal knowledge as to the accuracy of the information here as signed under penalties of perjury by your father?
A. I think that my personal knowledge is that would be accurate.
Q. Do you have any information of your personal knowledge that you acquired or knew about from the time prior to you becoming appointed personal representative of your mother's estate, or since you became personal representative of your mother's estate, that would materially change this \(\$ 25,000\) figure?
A. I do not.

MR. MANCERI: I don't have any further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Pratt.

BY MR. PRATT:
Q. You didn't prepare this inventory; did you?
A. I did not.
Q. You weren't involved in the preparation, at all?
A. I was not.
Q. Do you have -- you were only appointed as -strike that. Have you even been appointed as personal representative of your mother's estate yet?
A. Of my mother's estate?
Q. Yes.
A. I believe that I have.
Q. Do you know if the letters of administration have actually been issued?
A. I do not know that.
Q. You haven't seen any letters of administration?
A. I'm not sure right now.
Q. Since your appointment, or there was an order that was entered, what efforts have you made to determine the value of your mother's estate?
A. Of my mother's estate?
Q. Exactly.
A. I have not done that.
Q. On what basis, if you haven't done any investigation yourself, why would you say that this
\(\$ 25,000\) estimate of the value of the estate is accurate?
A. Well, upon my father's death I had to have the assets of the estate inventory that was done, so that was the combination of my mother's estate and my father's, at the time of his death. So based on that valuation at that time, that number was within reason of this number, so I think that we're talking within generalities the numbers are approximates and were pretty close to the numbers that were stated here.
Q. You're not serving as personal representative of your father's estate; are you?
A. I am not.
Q. You're just talking about the \(\$ 25,000\) value of the household furnishings, and not whether or not there's any other assets out there; is that right?
A. That's correct.

THE COURT: He was appointed September 24 th by the way. MR. PRATT: Okay. THE COURT: 2013. MR. PRATT: I have no further questions. THE COURT: You can step down. THE WITNESS: Thanks. THE COURT: You said you want to call another witness?

MR. MANCERI: I like to call Mr. Spallina, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Come up.
(Whereupon Mr. Spallina was sworn in by the Court.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. MANCERI:
Q. Mr. Spallina, good afternoon. As you heard, we've been asking questions about this inventory; are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes. I am.
Q. Tell the Court how you're familiar with it.
A. This was the inventory that we filed in the Shirley Bernstein estate, Your Honor.
Q. Were you one of the attorneys that represented Simon as personal representative of the Estate of Shirley Bernstein?
A. Yes. I was.
Q. And did you work with Simon Bernstein on creating this inventory to be filed in the probate court?
A. Yes. I did.
Q. All right. Did you meet and speak with Simon in furtherance of the preparation of this document?
A. Yes. We did.
Q. And that inventory reflects an estimated value of
\$25,000 comprised of furniture, furnishings, household goods, and personal effects, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Based on your dealings with Simon Bernstein, do you have any information or knowledge which would in any way contradict the value that's reflected on that inventory?
A. No. I do not.
Q. Have you come to learn in the furtherance of the administration of the estate of Simon Bernstein, because you were one of the co-PR's of that estate; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is there any information that you learned in furtherance of being the personal representative of Simon's estate that the \(\$ 25,000\) figure on this inventory is inaccurate?
A. No. I have not. This was a reasonable estimate of the estate.
Q. Now, did you or your firm handle the preparation of the estate planning documents for Shirley Bernstein?
A. Yes. We did.
Q. And one of the documents we heard that Shirley Bernstein had was what I'm going to call the Shirley Bernstein trust. Do you know what I'm referring to?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you work with Shirley Bernstein in furtherance of funding that trust while she was alive?
A. Yes. We did.
Q. To your knowledge, other than the assets that are on this inventory, and excluding things that you know would not be included, such as joint property and those assets, were all of her material assets, to your knowledge, funded into her trust before she died?
A. As far as we know, yes.

MR. MANCERI: I don't have any further questions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Pratt.

CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRATT:
Q. You said that you worked on preparing the inventory in Shirley Bernstein's estate?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me was that something that you handled personally, or something that you delegated to an assistant?
A. I called Simon, personally.
Q. But was there any efforts you made to contact like say banks or third-parties to determine if there was any other assets?
A. When we had a discussion about what to put on the
inventory, yes, and he said this was all there was to put on the inventory.
Q. This inventory is based off of information that you were given by Simon?
A. Correct.
Q. You basically took his word for it and didn't do any investigation of your own; is that right?
A. That's correct.

MR. PRATT: I have no further questions.
THE COURT: So there's an inventory and you are the \(P R\) of Simon, one of them.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: What's the status of his estate?

THE WITNESS: His estate is pending. There's litigation ongoing in the estate. We have waited on distributing anything from the estate due to the pending litigation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Did you file an inventory in Simon's estate?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Has the inventory been published?

THE WITNESS: I believe it has, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you have an inventory from Simon's estate?

MR. PRATT: No. We don't.
THE COURT: Do you object to them having it?

THE WITNESS: No.
THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to let you have it, Elliott. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You can have a seat.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
THE COURT: So technically the hearing today was to deal with the improprieties of the pleadings, meaning the prior waivers. I heard a lit about this last time. I know you brought in witness. Mr. Roth is here obviously because of Ms. Moran's potential difficulty, but \(I\) 'm trying to think of putting substance ahead of form to determine how it benefits the estate to go into that issue any further. So do you have a position on that Mr. Pratt, now that Eliot has had a chance to have the benefit of counsel and you've seen the newest round of waivers. There is no petition filed yet by Ted Bernstein. If he files one and the estate for some reason is not ready to be closed, or shouldn't be closed, we can deal with that at that time.

You know, sometimes things happen and the other side not having made a final decision on this, what \(I\) heard was not good about what I heard took place with respect to the processing of these documents, the waivers that the children signed and, essentially the one that was signed purportedly by Simon, but does it really matter, and \(I\) think I'd want it to matter before more time and money and energy is put into that, because if it's not going to put money into anybody's pocket, what good does it do just to tell Ms. Moran that she did a bad thing. If that's the case, I don't know that it is. I'm not finding that. MR. PRATT: I'm not too concerned about the validity of the waivers now that they've signed new waivers and they filed them. What We're trying to accomplish here is not to throw anybody under the bus, or burn anybody. We want a clear picture of what happened in this entire estate plan, and the parent's died --

THE COURT: I've got that, but Elliott is entitled to that which anyone else in his position is entitled to, no more no less, so I'm not restricting, nor am I expanding on this concept. There's laws that govern that what he is entitled to. They're saying that, you know, he's -- I mean, I don't know that there's a formal request in Shirley's estate for any other documentation other than that which you now have, because there is nothing else that is filed, and if what Ted says and what Mr. Spallina says is true, if we requested a final accounting we would get the same things, and that's not going to get you anywhere. That's what they said.

MR. PRATT: My concern is that we're not going to be in a giant rush to close the estate, not that we want to turn this --

THE COURT: There's no petition to close it right now. Let's be patient and see what happens and there may be reasons not to, or to close it, depending what goes on elsewhere. But given that, \(I\) don't even know other than what we now see in the inventories, because those are the two official documents, I don't know anything else about what monies may have passed through anyone's hands. But this isn't a case of first impression. The law deals with what potential beneficiaries are entitled to and what they're not, and what trustees can provide, and what not.

Let's be patient and do it in the correct forum. It seems like a lot, and what you want to accomplish is going to take place before Judge French, or if you can take it back to Judge Garrison.

MR. PRATT: Yea, I think you're right. We want to make sure that this piece of the puzzle is accurate, and if it is, you might not ever see us again.

THE COURT: So they say she funded the trust before her lifetime. Maybe she had some assets that were jointly titled. Those are not probate assets, they go just like people want. She may have cash under the pillow and it goes. So I'm going to take no further action right now on the issue of alleged impropriety or defects in the form of \(a\) pleading or other documents submitted to the court in furtherance of the closing of the
estate of Shirley Bernstein. I'm going to reserve on attorney's fees and any other possible sanction, if and when that matter becoming ripe for me to determine, but not today.

MR. MANCERI: Your Honor.
THE COURT: It may not Happen, at all.
MR. MANCERI: I want to address one thing that you mentioned, so everyone knows. We intend on filing a petition to close this estate very quickly.

THE COURT: But \(I\) can't preempt that and deal with that. We have to be patient and follow the rule. When you file it, you're going to make sure Elliott gets served. You serve him, and he can do whatever he wants with it. This is all rule driven.

MR. MANCERI: No question about it, Your Honor. We have the original waivers. As you know, we don't file the one's in ink anymore. We have them if you want to take them in open court.

THE COURT: No. E-files are good. You're allowed to e-file.

MR. MANCERI: We'll rest with that. We have a record.

THE COURT: I don't get files, you can tell.

MR. MANCERI: We have them.
MR. ROTH: Can \(I\) just address the Court, Judge, just to save some time in the future?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. ROTH: I represent Kimberly Moran. She has been charged by the state attorney's office in a direct information with improprieties regarding the notarization. She's fully cooperated with the sheriff's office. Just so you know so there's no mystery here, she caused to be filed the original waivers, which did not have a notarization. This is pursuant to her statement to the sheriff's office, it was her understanding they did not need to be notarized. Apparently Your Honor requires them to be notarized. In order not to "get in trouble" with Mr. Spallina and Mr. Tescher for improperly filing unsworn and un-notarized waivers, she stated to the sheriff's office that she did that. She recognized what she did was wrong. We surrendered her to the Palm Beach Sheriff's office jail on Friday. If she was called as a witness in this proceeding, she would respectfully evoke her 5th Amendment privilege.

THE COURT: That's one reason I had her to stay outside and tried not to bring her in, because we don't cross over things between criminal and probate, and we were going to leave it to another time and place.

MR. ROTH: She's a secretary that made a poor choice of judgment apparently, based upon what I've been told by the state attorney's office and the detective that investigated the case. I wanted you to be aware of that. It would be a waste of time for her to subpoenaed again, because she would evoke her privilege.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pratt, I don't think there's any doubt she's not going to testify that she's here pursuant to a request to do that. She has a 5th Amendment right and we're going to stick to that. I don't know that would benefit you anyway.

MR. PRATT: If she were to plead the 5th, we could draw whatever conclusions we want to from that. The ramifications of that, not that \(I\) plan to subpoena her in the future, or that \(I\) intend to question her about that, but if she pleads the 5 th in a civil case, then we can draw whenever conclusions we want to from --

THE COURT: You can draw adverse inferences from her, but she's nobody. It's not going to get you anywhere. Yes, I'll draw an adverse inference, but then it gets you zero.

MR. PRATT: There's other ways to get it in.

THE COURT: I don't think there's any doubt about what happened. I'm aware of it. I just don't like to make more trouble for people that --

MR. PRATT: I don't intend to.
THE COURT: It's not warranted. I didn't know she was charged. There's obviously consequences that she's now charged with a crime. So dealing with all that sounds to be enough, so let's leave that barking dog alone for right now and see where it gets everybody. It reaffirms my internal position that I made along with my case manager to require waivers to be notarized. This will be the case
example, that bench bar, as to why it will stay that way. We did it for a reason, not with this case in mind, but it's important now. We changed that rule soon after I got on the bench here in probate, and this isn't the only case where we had a problem with waivers and challenges later on, so it's a good idea to keep on doing that. No we just need to make sure we notarize them correctly, but I don't think that would be a problem. Prepare the order that \(I\) indicated and we'll be done for today. Thank you everyone. (Whereupon the Hearing was concluded at 5:13 p.m.)
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MR. MANCERI: Good morning, your Honor. We're here on the estate of Shirley Bernstein. We were here on a status conference that your JA called and instructed me to set. I think it's as a result of a letter \(I\) sent to court in respect for a motion to transfer that we had filed in front of Judge French. I sent you a letter. THE COURT: I have the motion to transfer. MR. MANCERI: Your assistant wasn't really sure what you wanted to accomplish today when she instructed me to set this hearing, but as a matter of fact, your Honor, there are two matters relating to two estates. One is the Estate of Shirley Bernstein, which is in front of you, and the Estate of Simon Bernstein, which is in front of Judge French. Eliot Bernstein, who was one of the children of Simon and Shirley Bernstein has filed numerous pleadings in both of the estates, all of them are virtually duplicates of one another, and under the administrative order 2.302, we have filed a motion to transfer and consolidate the two estates of Simon and Shirley Bernstein, who the are parents of Eliot Bernstein and my client, Ted Bernstein, as well as the grandchildren, who are
ultimate beneficiaries of both of these estate or the mother load of both of the estates, to transfer both of them to you because you have the lower case number. So we would ask that you consider -- and here is a notice of filing that I did, Judge, which shows -- these are schedules which show all of the various pleadings up through september 25 th that are comparative and duplicate between the two estates. As you may remember, your Honor, we're going to ask --

THE COURT: You're Eliot?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: What do you say about their motion?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well your Honor, the first thing is \(I\) think he just said he is representing my brother, Ted, when in fact, I believe Ted filed with you an appearance with Spallina, his client that was his counsel, and Mr. Manceri is representing, I believe, Spallina \& Tescher in his notices of appearance with your court. So I'm not exactly sure -- and one more thing, your Honor, just real quick to set the record straight, the Court fixed the docket -- your docket, and there is a list of respondents. I'd like to just make sure
-- take like an attendance of who is here -- who's represented.

THE COURT: I don't want you to do that, I just want to know what your position is on their motion.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well what is their motion is the first thing?

THE COURT: Basically, there is two estate cases of your parents, one is before me and one is before Judge French. I have the lower case number. They said there is some similar matters that are going on. They want one judge to handle it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: That motion that you're talking about was filed in Judge French's Court so you're ruling out Judge French's motion?

THE COURT: Sure, yes.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah?
THE COURT: He's not here.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, because that hearing was canceled. So my belief is that we shouldn't merge the cases at this point. We've got, you know, evidence of forgery and fraud in the court.

THE COURT: I don't want the merits of it. I want to know why, procedurally, we shouldn't have one judge hear the whole thing. It can be me or

Judge French, but --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well I filed a motion -THE COURT: -- the lower case number is with me.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I filed a motion this morning that it shouldn't be either of you two, that perhaps you guys need to be disqualified because you're centrally involved. The frauds occurred in your Court and on your court. Your signature is on a bunch of the documents that were used fraudulently to close the estate of my mother, which caused its opening, and it might have to go to two fresh judges, not that I'm saying that anybody's involved, but we have to depose you about signatures, about things in the Court and perhaps officers of the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: And further, your Honor --
THE COURT: Stop.
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- these officers --
THE COURT: Stop. I'm cutting you off.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Motion to transfer granted. The cases are not consolidated. They can be two separate cases, they're just both before me.

MR. MANCERI: That's correct, Judge. Under the administrative order, that's correct. THE COURT: Okay. What else for today? MR. MANCERI: That's it, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. (The proceedings concluded at 10:08 a.m.)
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TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (and all parties, associates and of counsel); ROBERT L, SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN
(as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

Respondents.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN VOLUME I

DATE: FEBRUARY 18, 2014

TIME: 1:32 P.M. - 2:38 P.M.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 6 & & & 8 \\
\hline & all interested persons and their counsel. & 1 & attorneys for Ted, who is the personal & \\
\hline 2 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Good afternoon, Your & 2 & representative of that estate. & \\
\hline 3 & Honor. On behalf of Defendant Bernstein, the & 3 & If the Judge, Your Honor, let's them out, & \\
\hline 4 & trustee of the decedent's revocable trust, we & 4 & I would ask that there be provisions in the & \\
\hline 5 & stipulate that you may accept the resignation & 5 & order such that the Court retains jurisdiction & \\
\hline 6 & of the two co-personal representatives. & 6 & over them, that they don't walk away & \\
\hline 7 & In their prayer for relief they ask Your & 7 & discharged, that they are still before Your & \\
\hline 8 & Honor to handle everything else at a later date & 8 & Honor to the extent that if it is determined & \\
\hline 9 & and we consent to that. Clearly, we can't have & 9 & that there was some sort of problem with the & \\
\hline 10 & a petition for discharge. We can stipulate -- & 10 & drafting of the will, with the administration & \\
\hline 11 & or, excuse me, we can agree that you can accept & 11 & of the estate, or any other of these issues & \\
\hline 12 & their resignations and later appoint another & 12 & that they're still -- & \\
\hline 13 & personal representative. & 13 & THE COURT: Well, did you see their & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Okay. & 14 & wherefore clause? & \\
\hline 15 & MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on & 15 & MR. GLASKO: I'm sorry? & \\
\hline 16 & behalf of Mr. Stansbury, interested person. & 16 & THE COURT: Did you see their wherefore & \\
\hline 17 & We have no objection to the petition. & 17 & clause? & \\
\hline 18 & There is a proposed order that was submitted to & 18 & MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 19 & us this morning. We have only one objection to & 19 & THE COURT: It says they wanted me to & \\
\hline 20 & the proposed order when Your Honor is ready to & 20 & accept their resignation, revoke their letters, & \\
\hline 21 & consider that. & 21 & and reserve on all issues relating to & \\
\hline 22 & THE COURT: Okay. Counsel. & 22 & discharge. & \\
\hline 23 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, William Glasko. There & 23 & MR. GLASKO: Okay. And I don't have an & \\
\hline 24 & is a few motions set for today. And I just & 24 & objection to them getting out. I haven't seen & \\
\hline 25 & want to make a comment about the bigger issue, & 25 & the proposed order. & \\
\hline & 7 & & & 9 \\
\hline 1 & which is that this law firm represented Simon & 1 & THE COURT: Okay. I thought --I heard it & \\
\hline 2 & Bernstein and prepared his will. My & 2 & was circulated. Maybe you didn't get it to & \\
\hline 3 & understanding is that there are issues of & 3 & him. Have him take a look at it. & \\
\hline 4 & forgery. There have been some criminal cases & 4 & MR. TESCHER: He may not have. & \\
\hline 5 & opened as a result of some forgeries that & 5 & MR. PANKAUSKI: I haven't seen it either, & \\
\hline 6 & relate to estate documents. & 6 & Your Honor. & \\
\hline 7 & My understanding is that in discovery & 7 & THE COURT: Okay, Take a look. This is & \\
\hline 8 & there were two trust amendments to the mother's & 8 & the time to do it. & \\
\hline 9 & trust, which there is some question as to & 9 & And Eliot is pro se. Can someone give him & \\
\hline 10 & whether or not there is a forgery in that. We & 10 & a copy, as well? & \\
\hline 11 & believe that there is an undue influence and/or & 11 & MR. TESCHER: I believe Mr. Bernstein did & \\
\hline 12 & tortious inference case. & 12 & get one. & \\
\hline 13 & My firm was just retained last night. And & 13 & THE COURT: Did you get a copy, Eliot? & \\
\hline 14 & I've had a limited ability to review these & 14 & MR, BERNSTEIN: I've got so many things in & \\
\hline 15 & documents. But based on what l've seen and & 15 & the last few days. & \\
\hline 16 & what I've heard, we intend to open an action & 16 & THE COURT: Well, okay, but did you get a & \\
\hline 17 & for undue influence, single tortious & 17 & copy of the proposed order? & \\
\hline 18 & interference in this case as it relates to the & 18 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I see it? I don't & \\
\hline 19 & father's will, which was drafted by Tescher \& & 19 & think so. & \\
\hline 20 & Spallina. & 20 & THE COURT: If you have one for me that & \\
\hline 21 & My concern, Judge, is that if you let & 21 & would be helpful. I can look at it at the same & \\
\hline 22 & these lawyers out as co-personal & 22 & time. & \\
\hline 23 & representatives. And, again, what l've seen is & 23 & MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't recall ever seeing & \\
\hline 24 & a second notice of hearing on mom's estate & 24 & this. & \\
\hline 25 & where they're asking to withdraw as the & 25 & THE COURT: Say it again. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 10 & & & 12 \\
\hline & MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't recall ever seeing & 1 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay. & \\
\hline 2 & this. & 2 & THE COURT: They're not being discharged, & \\
\hline 3 & THE COURT: Okay. Well, look at it. & 3 & they're resigning and their letters to revoke. & \\
\hline 4 & Thank you. & 4 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. & \\
\hline 5 & MR. GLASKO: I have no objection to that, & 5 & THE COURT: Okay. So why do we need to, & \\
\hline 6 & Judge. & 6 & in this order, fund what the successor PR or & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: Okay. So there's no objection & 7 & curator is to perhaps -- & \\
\hline 8 & from Mr. Glasko for his clients. & 8 & MR. BLOCK: We have no objection to & \\
\hline 9 & Mr. Feaman, you said there was one area, & 9 & striking that paragraph. & \\
\hline 10 & you had an objection to the form of the order? & 10 & THE COURT: Okay. I'm striking it. & \\
\hline 11 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor, if it please & 11 & MR. GLASKO: Striking the entire paragraph & \\
\hline 12 & the Court. & 12 & six? & \\
\hline 13 & THE COURT: Where is that? & 13 & THE COURT: Number six out, yeah. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Paragraph six recites, Your & 14 & MR. GLASKO: Thank you, sir. & \\
\hline 15 & Honor, that the successor personal & 15 & THE COURT: I'm going to add, though, a & \\
\hline 16 & representative or curator is authorized to pay & 16 & new number six which is that -- and here's the & \\
\hline 17 & blank dollars retainer. & 17 & language. I'll write it for myself and then & \\
\hline 18 & I respectfully suggest to the Court that & 18 & I'll tell you what I'm going to do. & \\
\hline 19 & that should be left up to the discretion of the & 19 & Okay. Number six says, The Court reserves & \\
\hline 20 & successor personal representative or the & 20 & jurisdiction to enforce this order. & \\
\hline 21 & curator, as the case may be, to make that & 21 & Okay. l've signed it with the changes. & \\
\hline 22 & decision. I don't think, at this time, that we & 22 & MR. TESCHER: Your Honor, there is one & \\
\hline 23 & need to be in the position to anticipate or go & 23 & blank -- & \\
\hline 24 & that far. & 24 & THE COURT: Oh, so hold on. Paragraph & \\
\hline 25 & THE COURT: Okay. I understand what & 25 & two, there is a blank there. What is it that & \\
\hline & 11 & & & 13 \\
\hline 1 & you're saying. & 1 & the moving party is asking that I put in there & \\
\hline 2 & MR. FEAMAN: Other than that, I have no & 2 & where it says within blank days, business days? & \\
\hline 3 & objection. & 3 & MR. BLOCK: What do you want, 60 days? & \\
\hline 4 & THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Pankauski? & 4 & MR. TESCHER: It's the later of, I think, & \\
\hline 5 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No objection, Your Honor. & 5 & the date of the order or when the successor is & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: Okay. And Eliot Bernstein? & 6 & appointed, if I'm not mistaken. Thirty days to & \\
\hline 7 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Just the objections I & 7 & 60 days would be fine. & \\
\hline 8 & raised in the filing on February 14th. & 8 & THE COURT: Okay. Counsel. & \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: That's - okay. So I don't & 9 & MR. FEAMAN: That sounds too long to me, & \\
\hline 10 & know what those are. Right now the only & 10 & Your Honor. & \\
\hline 11 & question is do you agree with the form of the & 11 & THE COURT: Well, give me the -- & \\
\hline 12 & order? & 12 & MR. FEAMAN: I would say five business & \\
\hline 13 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. & 13 & days he can begin the process of turning & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Okay. & 14 & everything over. & \\
\hline 15 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Except the part that he's & 15 & THE COURT: Well, this doesn't say begin & \\
\hline 16 & saying about the amount. & 16 & the process. This says, shall deliver. That's & \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: Number six? & 17 & all the property. That's everything. That & \\
\hline 18 & MR. BERNSTEIN: And is there bonding or & 18 & would be by next Monday every single thing in & \\
\hline 19 & surety? & 19 & the estate is to be turned over to a successor, & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Well, there is no bond on a & 20 & who I haven't even named yet. & \\
\hline 21 & discharge. & 21 & MR. FEAMAN: And assuming that you don't & \\
\hline 22 & MR. BERNSTEIN: We're not discharging him & 22 & name a successor today, then I would like to & \\
\hline 23 & yet, are we? & 23 & see that done within 10 business days so we can & \\
\hline 24 & THE COURT: Yeah, I'm sorry, no bond on a & 24 & move this along, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 25 & resignation. & 25 & THE COURT: Okay. What do you say, & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 14 & & & 16 \\
\hline 1 & Mr. Pankauski? & 1 & prior lawyers without the specific reservation. & \\
\hline 2 & MR. PANKAUSKI: I think you need more like & 2 & What I was asking for was a specific & \\
\hline 3 & a couple weeks, 14, 15. & 3 & reservation just so that it's clear to all & \\
\hline 4 & MR. GLASKO: No objection to 14. & 4 & parties that these lawyers are still part of & \\
\hline 5 & MR. BLOCK: We would like 15 days. & 5 & this litigation, in as much as there are live & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: You would like what? & 6 & and actual circumstances being litigated right & \\
\hline 7 & MR. BLOCK: Fifteen. & 7 & now that relate to their conduct. & \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: Fifteen. Okay. Sol have 10, & 8 & So what I don't want is just a clean & \\
\hline 9 & 14, 15. & 9 & order. & \\
\hline 10 & Eliot, what do you want? You want & 10 & THE COURT: Okay. So give me the legal & \\
\hline 11 & tomorrow, right? & 11 & authority for what you're asking. Give me the & \\
\hline 12 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Yesterday. & 12 & statute or the case that says that what you & \\
\hline 13 & THE COURT: Okay. Sure. & 13 & want is appropriate in an order on a motion to & \\
\hline 14 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you. & 14 & withdraw. & \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: Okay. I don't want you folks & 15 & MR. GLASKO: I just wanted to clarify. I & \\
\hline 16 & to argue about what a business day is. It's & 16 & don't have a statute or a case. & \\
\hline 17 & going to be March 4th. It can be sooner. & 17 & THE COURT: Any authoritative basis from & \\
\hline 18 & All right. I'll get you copies. & 18 & any source for that? & \\
\hline 19 & Okay. What's next? & 19 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, I think the Court has & \\
\hline 20 & MR. TESCHER: Your Honor, there is a & 20 & jurisdiction and discretion to clarify in the & \\
\hline 21 & companion order, petition and order to withdraw & 21 & order that the attorneys are not being let go. & \\
\hline 22 & as counsel on the Simon Bernstein estate. & 22 & THE COURT: Okay. & \\
\hline 23 & THE COURT: Any objection? & 23 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Excuse me, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 24 & MR. GLASKO: Once again, Judge, I just & 24 & THE COURT: Yes. & \\
\hline 25 & want to make sure that the reservation of & 25 & MR. PANKAUSKI: The firm of Tescher \& & \\
\hline & 15 & & & 17 \\
\hline 1 & jurisdiction is in the order with regard to the & 1 & Spallina and Mr. Spallina represent Mr. Tescher & \\
\hline 2 & attorneys and any part that they may have in & 2 & and Mr. Spallina as co-personal representatives & \\
\hline 3 & subsequent litigation. & 3 & of the estate. They don't represent Ted & \\
\hline 4 & THE COURT: I'll take a look at the order. & 4 & Bernstein. & \\
\hline 5 & Show it to him. & 5 & I think what the order was intended to say & \\
\hline 6 & So if you wouldn't mind, Mr. Spallina, to & 6 & was that Tescher \& Spallina and Robert Spallina & \\
\hline 7 & circulate the order to everybody. & 7 & are authorized to withdraw as the attorneys for & \\
\hline 8 & Well, Mr. Pankauski, you're going to be & 8 & the co-personal representatives. & \\
\hline 9 & representing Ted; is that correct? & 9 & THE COURT: Or for Ted Bernstein in his & \\
\hline 10 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor, along & 10 & personal representative capacity? & \\
\hline 11 & with Mr. Rose. & 11 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Mr. Bernstein isn't & \\
\hline 12 & THE COURT: Okay. So, I mean, they could & 12 & personal representative of the Simon Bernstein & \\
\hline 13 & do this by an order or by a stipulation for & 13 & estate. & \\
\hline 14 & substitution, either one. & 14 & THE COURT: Okay. So what's -- & \\
\hline 15 & So tell me the legal basis for what you & 15 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Mr. Spallina individually & \\
\hline 16 & want added to this order. & 16 & and Mr . Tescher individually were the & \\
\hline 17 & MR. GLASKO: Well, Judge, what I want -- & 17 & co-personal representatives. & \\
\hline 18 & THE COURT: Tell me what the law -- give & 18 & THE COURT: Well, I'm sorry, I'm confused. & \\
\hline 19 & me the law first, because l'll just allow a & 19 & They say in their motion and order that they & \\
\hline 20 & stipulation. People are just allowed to always & 20 & represent Ted Bernstein. That's not true in & \\
\hline 21 & substitute one lawyer for another, & 21 & this case? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. GLASKO: If there were a stipulation & 22 & MR. PANKAUSKI: That's correct, in the & \\
\hline 23 & of substitution of counsel and the Court & 23 & Estate of Simon Bernstein. & \\
\hline 24 & entered the order, I think the Court, I think & 24 & THE COURT: Okay. Who do you represent in & \\
\hline 25 & the Court would have jurisdiction over the & & the Estate of Simon Bernstein? & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 20 \\
\hline 1 & MR. TESCHER: We represent ourselves. & 1 & the attorney for Ted Bernstein? & \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's not what & 2 & MR. TESCHER: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 3 & the order says. & 3 & THE COURT: Okay. Any objection? & \\
\hline 4 & MR. TESCHER: You are correct, that is... & 4 & MR. GLASKO: Again, Judge, I would ask for & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: So what should the order say? & 5 & a reservation of jurisdiction. & \\
\hline 6 & MR. TESCHER: Withdrawal of counsel for & 6 & THE COURT: Okay. Do you have & \\
\hline 7 & personal representatives, Donald R. Tescher and & 7 & authoritative position on that? & \\
\hline 8 & Robert Spallina. & 8 & MR. GLASKO: I don't. & \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: All right. So do you have a & 9 & THE COURT: That request is denied, & \\
\hline 10 & different position now that they've said that? & 10 & because if you want to have a request like & \\
\hline 11 & MR. GLASKO: No, Judge. I actually & 11 & that, have authority to support it. & \\
\hline 12 & thought we were all on the order where they & 12 & MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 13 & were asking to withdraw as attorneys in the & 13 & THE COURT: Just asking without authority & \\
\hline 14 & Shirley estate. & 14 & won't do it. & \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: No. We're still on Simon's & 15 & Okay. Granted. & \\
\hline 16 & case. & 16 & MR. TESCHER: Your Honor, that concludes & \\
\hline 17 & MR. GLASKO: So they've asked to be let go & 17 & the three motions that we had filed for hearing & \\
\hline 18 & as personal representatives and the second & 18 & at 1:30. & \\
\hline 19 & order is discharged as the attorneys for & 19 & THE COURT: So I know there are more & \\
\hline 20 & themselves? & 20 & motions. Do you folks want them to stay around & \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: Right. & 21 & for the next series of motions? & \\
\hline 22 & Okay. That's granted. & 22 & MR. BLOCK: No, sir. & \\
\hline 23 & And, Mr. Spallina, you're the attorney for & 23 & THE COURT: No, I'm asking the other & \\
\hline 24 & yourself in this case, correct? & 24 & people who are moving parties. & \\
\hline 25 & MR. SPALLINA: Yes, sir. & 25 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor, they're & \\
\hline & & & & 21 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: And you're also the attorney & 1 & not required to stay. & \\
\hline 2 & for the -- and the law firm is attorney for & 2 & THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. We'll get you & \\
\hline 3 & who? For themselves, for itself? & 3 & copies if you wait outside. & \\
\hline 4 & MR. SPALLINA: For the co-PRs of the & 4 & MR. BLOCK: Thank you. & \\
\hline 5 & estate. & 5 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Excuse me, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: And who is that? & 6 & Did they resign as trustees, too, as well as & \\
\hline 7 & MR. SPALLINA: Donald Tescher and Robert & 7 & PR? Is that in there? & \\
\hline 8 & Spallina. & 8 & THE COURT: No, nothing about any trust is & \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: Okay. And you're withdrawing & 9 & before me. & \\
\hline 10 & as attorneys for yourselves in your capacity as & 10 & (Mr. Block, Mr. Tescher and Mr. Spallina & \\
\hline 11 & co-PR? & 11 & left the courtroom.) & \\
\hline 12 & MR. TESCHER: Yes, Your Honor. & 12 & THE COURT: Okay. So now I have a motion & \\
\hline 13 & THE COURT: All right. Go ahead. & 13 & for appointment of Ted Bernstein as curator, a & \\
\hline 14 & MR. TESCHER: Your Honor, the third motion & 14 & motion for appointment of Eliot Bernstein as & \\
\hline 15 & that we set for today was on the Shirley & 15 & curator or successor PR, or, in the & \\
\hline 16 & Bernstein estate for an order on a motion to & 16 & alternative, some other motions. And I know & \\
\hline 17 & withdraw as counsel. & 17 & that because I have the response from & \\
\hline 18 & THE COURT: Okay. Any objection? & 18 & Mr. Feaman, but I don't have the motion itself. & \\
\hline 19 & MR. PANKAUSKI: I'm sure I don't. | just & 19 & MR. PANKAUSKI: The motion. & \\
\hline 20 & need to see the order, Your Honor. & 20 & THE COURT: I need the moving -- you know & \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: Okay. Here you say your & 21 & what, I just got some things in the mail. Let & \\
\hline 22 & attorney for Ted Bernstein here again. & 22 & me see. & \\
\hline 23 & MR. TESCHER: That is correct in the & 23 & Okay. I have Ted Bernstein's motion for & \\
\hline 24 & Shirley Bernstein estate, Your Honor. & 24 & appointment of curator or administrator ad & \\
\hline 25 & THE COURT: So in Shirley's estate you are & 25 & litem. Is that the traveling pleading? & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. And I have Mr. Feaman's response in opposition.

Okay. Are there any other pleadings that I am to consider?

MR. FEAMAN: No. I have an ore tenus matter that I was apprised of this morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. But no one's telling me that, though.

MR. FEAMAN: It's -
THE COURT: Oh, it's your ore tenus
motion?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, mine.
THE COURT: Okay. Sure.
MR. FEAMAN: I'm asking permission to say
it.
THE COURT: Okay. Sure.
MR. FEAMAN: I found out from Eliot
Bernstein this morning that he -- the ore tenus motion is an objection to Mr. Pankauski representing Ted Bernstein in this matter.

The basis of the motion, and I'm prepared to call Mr. Eliot Bernstein to the stand, is that Eliot Bernstein consulted with
everybody is here, why don't I at least have a hearing on or see what's going on with the current motions. I may defer on entering an order until I determine what the merits are of your motion to disqualify.

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Any objection to that procedure?

MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor.
MR. GLASKO: No, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. So now on Simon's estate, because I let go the prior PRs, are we now in a situation where there is no PR or curator of Simon's estate; is that true?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Everyone agree with that?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: So does everyone agree we need
to have someone take their place, that is
Tescher and Spallina?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir.
MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So let me go around the room.
Mr. Pankauski, what is your request for

Mr. Pankauski to represent him and had a couple of one-hour telephone conversations concerning the representation of Mr. Pankauski, supplied him documents, which were very germane to Mr. Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein's position in this case, which are not aligned with Mr. Ted Bernstein.

And so I'm prepared to go forward and present evidence today.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. But a motion for disqualification of counsel has to be in writing. You may have just learned about it, but that definitely has to be reduced to writing.

MR. FEAMAN: It does, Your Honor. However, I don't want to be in a position to have waived anything by allowing the attorney to go forward and let my silence --

THE COURT: How about this, not knowing, other than what you just told me and not hearing from Mr. Pankauski, --

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: -- I'm going to let you or
whoever thinks it's appropriate file that
motion in writing. But, in the meantime, since
relief in that area?
MR. PANKAUSKI: That you appoint Ted
Bernstein as curator.
THE COURT: And, Mr. Feaman, what's your position there?

MR. FEAMAN: Our position is that we suggest Eliot Bernstein or, in the alternative, an attorney that l've suggested to counsel is Brian O'Connell from the law firm of Casey,
Ciklin -- I guess it's Ciklin, Lubitz now, a Board-certified probate wills and trust attorney for over 20 years to be a curator.

THE COURT: I know Mr. O'Connell.
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Until we can get this straightened out, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What do you say?
MR. GLASKO: Judge, I would like to see an independent curator appointed. We believe that both Ted and Eliot are going to be fact witnesses with regard to the issues that are going forward in this case.

The attorneys were common to Ted and the decedent Simon with regard to a will that was drafted subsequent to the original will with regard to trust modifications and so forth, so.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 28 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: So when you say an independent & 1 & who we kind of pick by consensus of the moving & \\
\hline 2 & curator, you mean someone other than the person & 2 & parties or some other neutral method. & \\
\hline 3 & suggested by Mr. Feaman? & 3 & Is this a case that -- why shouldn't that & \\
\hline 4 & MR. GLASKO: Neither Ted nor Eliot, but an & 4 & position be the one that I take on this as & \\
\hline 5 & independent. These people are fact witnesses & 5 & opposed to having an interested person such as & \\
\hline 6 & and I believe there is a conflict, particularly & 6 & Ted involved? & \\
\hline 7 & with Ted. & 7 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, Mr. Bernstein & \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: All right. So how do -- I & 8 & is uniquely qualified to serve and he's willing & \\
\hline 9 & mean, this is a pick a name out of the hat type & 9 & to serve without compensation. & \\
\hline 10 & situation? & 10 & He also has personal knowledge about & \\
\hline 11 & MR. GLASKO: I'm sorry? & 11 & litigation which the estate is involved in. He & \\
\hline 12 & THE COURT: When you say an independent, & 12 & also has personal knowledge about the assets & \\
\hline 13 & how is that independent person going to be & 13 & and liabilities of the decedent, his father. & \\
\hline 14 & derived? & 14 & THE COURT: So let me -- did Simon die & \\
\hline 15 & MR. GLASKO: Well, I would suggest that & 15 & testate or intestate? & \\
\hline 16 & the Court could appoint somebody. & 16 & MR. PANKAUSKI: He died with a will, & \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: No, I don't do that anymore, & 17 & testate. & \\
\hline 18 & because the last time I did that and that & 18 & THE COURT: And who were the designated & \\
\hline 19 & curator or PR or trustee actually sought fees, & 19 & PRs? & \\
\hline 20 & the issue came up, well, I may be more & 20 & MR. PANKAUSKI: The designated PRs were & \\
\hline 21 & favorable to that person because I appointed & 21 & Mr. Tescher and Mr. Spallina, who have now & \\
\hline 22 & them. & 22 & resigned. & \\
\hline 23 & MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir. & 23 & THE COURT: Okay. And no one else? & \\
\hline 24 & THE COURT: Sol don't have any active & 24 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Correct. No successor was & \\
\hline 25 & involvement in the selection any longer of the & 25 & named in the will. & \\
\hline & & & & 29 \\
\hline 1 & person in that position. & 1 & THE COURT: Is there a preference of & \\
\hline 2 & MR. GLASKO: Then I would ask the Court to & 2 & appointment that someone has at this stage? & \\
\hline 3 & direct all counsel to agree to somebody. & 3 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Well, nobody has a & \\
\hline 4 & THE COURT: Okay. So -- & 4 & majority in interest of the rev trust & \\
\hline 5 & MR. GLASKO: May I make one more point, & 5 & beneficiaries, no. & \\
\hline 6 & Judge? & 6 & THE COURT: Everyone agree with that? & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: Go ahead. & 7 & MR. FEAMAN: That's correct. & \\
\hline 8 & MR. GLASKO: I wanted to make sure that & 8 & THE COURT: No preference, okay. & \\
\hline 9 & the Court understands, I just came into this & 9 & All right. So it's Ted against the world. & \\
\hline 10 & case, sol know you know more than I do or at & 10 & Okay. So I got it. & \\
\hline 11 & least I believe you know the case. & 11 & Well, no, you want Eliot or who, Mr. & \\
\hline 12 & The original estate plan was -- there are & 12 & Feaman? & \\
\hline 13 & five children, three were going to receive. & 13 & MR. FEAMAN: Eliot or independent. & \\
\hline 14 & The will -- & 14 & THE COURT: Or independent. Okay. & \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: You want to just tell me & 15 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Excuse me, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 16 & something ahead of what everyone else wants to & 16 & THE COURT: And, Eliot, who do you want? & \\
\hline 17 & tell me now. You want this be your opening & 17 & MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm happy with Peter's. & \\
\hline 18 & statement? & 18 & I'm happy with the independent. I'd like to be & \\
\hline 19 & MR. GLASKO: No, that's fine, Judge. & 19 & a co-personal representative and l'll, you & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Because I'm ready to go into & 20 & know, bow out of any conflict situation that I & \\
\hline 21 & hearing your positions. No, I'm going to let & 21 & would see and feel obligated to. & \\
\hline 22 & everyone be heard. & 22 & THE COURT: Okay. All right. & \\
\hline 23 & Okay. So, Mr. Pankauski, you want Ted. & 23 & So, Mr. Pankauski, you're up on your & \\
\hline 24 & Mr. Feaman wants an independent, but he says & 24 & motion. & \\
\hline 25 & Brian O'Connell. Mr. Glasko says independent & 25 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Mr. Ted Bernstein, my client, is not a beneficiary under the estate. He also is trustee of his father's revocable trust.

And I'm prepared to call Ted to ask him questions so you have a record.

THE COURT: Okay. Your first witness.
MR. FEAMAN: Your Honor, if it please the
Court, I have prepared an opening statement, if
Your Honor would allow it.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FEAMAN: It's fairly brief.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
MR. FEAMAN: All right. Thank you, Your
Honor.
If I may approach the --
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FEAMAN: I represent Mr. Stansbury.
And I want to set a little predicate as to who Mr. Stansbury is. He's a creditor of the estate, because he's a plaintiff and the estate is one of the defendants.

However, Your Honor, Mr. Stansbury is a lot more than that as it relates to Ted Bernstein. Because before the passing of Simon Bernstein, which brings us here foday,

Your Honor, the amended complaint was attached.
May I approach?
THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you. And it's marked
as Stansbury's Exhibit B, Your Honor.
I'd like to draw your attention first to
Count IV of the second amended complaint,
because Count IV is a count against Mr. Ted
Bernstein, but it's not against Simon Bernstein.

And there are other claims throughout this complaint which show that while they're co-defendants, as discovery progresses, Your Honor, it can easily come to pass that there could be cross-claims between the co-defendants for indemnification or contribution depending on the degree of negligence that a jury may assign at some point.

So we would ask that because of that, Your Honor, there is clear conflict of interest that would -- that arises because Mr. Ted Bernstein, should he become appointed as the either curator or successor personal representative, as an individual defendant and managing the affairs of the estate, there can easily be

Mr. Stansbury brought suit against Simon Bernstein, but also his son Ted Bernstein, both in their individual capacities and various corporations that they controlled.

During the time that Mr. Stansbury, who is in the courtroom today, did business with the Bernsteins through life insurance companies. Now, the claims in the underlying estate are for breach of fiduciary duty against both father and son, breach of contract, fraud in the inducement.

And while it may seem on the surface that as co-defendants their interests are aligned, it's not, because it's a multi-count complaint, Your Honor. And one of the iterations of the complaint is attached to our submission.

We have a second complaint. The second complaint, Your Honor, which is more relevant. The second amended complaint --

THE COURT: And these are circuit civil actions, correct?

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor. They're in Judge Peter Blanc's division.

And the second amended complaint, which is actually the operative document. I apologize,
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 34 & & & 36 \\
\hline & direct the proceeds of the life insurance & 1 & THE COURT: I've got it for opening & \\
\hline 2 & policy on Simon Bernstein's life directly to & 2 & statement purposes. I understand what you're & \\
\hline 3 & the kids rather than to the estate. & 3 & saying. I'll let you present some evidence. & \\
\hline 4 & Right there that sets up a terrible & 4 & MR. FEAMAN: Thank you. & \\
\hline 5 & conflict of interest based on his past conduct. & 5 & THE COURT: Do you have an opening, & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: Who is the beneficiary of the & 6 & counsel, that you want to give? & \\
\hline 7 & life insurance? & 7 & MR. GLASKO: No, sir. & \\
\hline 8 & MR. FEAMAN: Well, that's what's in & 8 & THE COURT: All right. So let me ask & \\
\hline 9 & dispute, Your Honor, because they claim that & 9 & this. Mr. Pankauski, Mr. Feaman suggested & \\
\hline 10 & there is an insurance trust that set up the & 10 & through an oral motion, which I'm not going to & \\
\hline 11 & children as the beneficiaries. However, the & 11 & act on, that there may be grounds to disqualify & \\
\hline 12 & insurance trust is lost and nobody can find it. & 12 & you from representing Ted Bernstein and sort of & \\
\hline 13 & So Heritage said, in the absence of a & 13 & discussed it a little bit in open court. & \\
\hline 14 & designated beneficiary, as you know, it should & 14 & I've already said and he's required by the & \\
\hline 15 & go to the estate. & 15 & rule to put it in writing. He suggested that & \\
\hline 16 & So there is an impleader action going on & 16 & there may have been some prior representation & \\
\hline 17 & up in the Northern District of Illinois. And & 17 & of Eliot Bernstein. & \\
\hline 18 & that is in direct response of Ted Bernstein & 18 & I want to do something right now that I & \\
\hline 19 & trying to direct those -- and, by the way, it's & 19 & think is appropriate. I'm going to recess for & \\
\hline 20 & not an insubstantial sum, Your Honor, it's & 20 & a few minutes and I want you to talk to Mr. & \\
\hline 21 & \(\$ 1.7\) million. My client's claims against the & 21 & Feaman outside so there is no record of this & \\
\hline 22 & estate are that and more. & 22 & discussion, because I want, if a motion is & \\
\hline 23 & So this is very significant that & 23 & filed, I want it to be in writing. & \\
\hline 24 & Mr. Bernstein would try to redirect that, which & 24 & But I think what I want you to do, & \\
\hline 25 & certainly he has the -- if he thinks he has the & 25 & Mr. Feaman, is tell him as much as you know & \\
\hline & 35 & & & 37 \\
\hline 1 & right to do, Your Honor. & 1 & about the situation. And then you, having & \\
\hline 2 & I don't blame Mr. Bernstein in his & 2 & heard it, let me know whether you still think & \\
\hline 3 & individual capacity to try to keep money out of & 3 & it's appropriate to go forward with & \\
\hline 4 & the estate if he's a beneficiary of the estate, & 4 & representing Ted or that there's a bona fide & \\
\hline 5 & but once he crosses that line as the personal & 5 & reason that under the conflict of interest & \\
\hline 6 & representative -- & 6 & rules you can't. & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: You're kind of going out of & 7 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood. & \\
\hline 8 & opening statement to closing argument. & 8 & THE COURT: So go ahead. Let's do that & \\
\hline 9 & MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. I'll & 9 & first and then we'll get back. & \\
\hline 10 & move on. & 10 & Just let my bailiff know when you are & \\
\hline 11 & And then further, Your Honor, the law is & 11 & ready. & \\
\hline 12 & such that Ted Bernstein has made & 12 & (Brief recess taken.) & \\
\hline 13 & misrepresentations to this Court and others in & 13 & THE COURT: Okay. So were you able to & \\
\hline 14 & the past in connection with the Shirley & 14 & have that informal conversation? & \\
\hline 15 & Bernstein estate and in connection with this & 15 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 16 & estate and other governmental authorities' & 16 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 17 & evidence we would put on, which would show that & 17 & THE COURT: So are you still going to go & \\
\hline 18 & Ted Bernstein is, outside of the conflict of & 18 & forward with that written motion? & \\
\hline 19 & interest, is not otherwise qualified based on & 19 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes. & \\
\hline 20 & his basic character in how he has conducted & 20 & THE COURT: Okay. And is there a bona & \\
\hline 21 & himself in the past, which, as Your Honor & 21 & fide basis for the filing of the motion? & \\
\hline 22 & knows, since there is no preference, Your Honor & 22 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. In fact, & \\
\hline 23 & is allowed to take in the totality of the & 23 & I'm content to have you decide whether l'm & \\
\hline 24 & situation as to whether Mr. Bernstein should be & 24 & disqualified right here and right now. & \\
\hline 25 & appointed as a personal representative. & 25 & THE COURT: Yeah, but I can't do that & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 40 \\
\hline & without it in writing. I just did a little & 1 & THE COURT: Okay. Well, Mr. -- & \\
\hline 2 & research on that, because I think l've had this & 2 & MR. FEAMAN: But I don't know if he's -- & \\
\hline 3 & issue come up one time before that actually got & 3 & THE COURT: Right, but he wants & \\
\hline 4 & this far. And I think, one, it has to be in & 4 & Mr. Pankauski for purposes of this motion. & \\
\hline 5 & writing because there is some verification & 5 & MR. FEAMAN: I'll file that motion & \\
\hline 6 & requirements. & 6 & tomorrow, Your Honor. I have no interest in & \\
\hline 7 & MR. FEAMAN: Right. & 7 & trying to delay. & \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: So the form of it is & 8 & THE COURT: Sure, I understand that. So & \\
\hline 9 & important. & 9 & let me just see how -- now we have this new & \\
\hline 10 & I dealt with this issue in a family law & 10 & calendaring system. Let me see how this thing & \\
\hline 11 & case, but it was long enough ago that I tried & 11 & works. & \\
\hline 12 & to pull the order that I wrote, but it's not & 12 & Okay. All right. So, I mean, what l'm & \\
\hline 13 & imaged, so I can't get it, so I could get a & 13 & going to say now would take everyone to want to & \\
\hline 14 & better handle on what the standards were, given & 14 & be able to do this. If you can literally get & \\
\hline 15 & that the representation was that you had & 15 & it done immediately, I have time tomorrow & \\
\hline 16 & consulted with another party, that is Eliot & 16 & afternoon that opened, if everyone can do it. & \\
\hline 17 & Bernstein, in some form. & 17 & MR. FEAMAN: I could file it by & \\
\hline 18 & And that was exactly the issue in this & 18 & 5:00 o'clock tomorrow, Your Honor. I can't get & \\
\hline 19 & other case that I dealt with. If you want, I & 19 & it done. I've got a hearing on Thursday in & \\
\hline 20 & can tell you what the other case is in a few & 20 & another court I have to prepare for. I have a & \\
\hline 21 & moments. & 21 & meeting with a client in Delray later today. & \\
\hline 22 & The only thing l'm thinking about, though, & 22 & THE COURT: All right. Let me look. & \\
\hline 23 & is with a motion to disqualify, I'm not certain & 23 & Hold on. This is - I don't have, they & \\
\hline 24 & now whether it's appropriate to go forward on & & don't let me have a book anymore. They took it & \\
\hline 25 & these motions that are left. And I think not, & 25 & away from me. And now they make the computer & \\
\hline & & & & 41 \\
\hline 1 & because that's what I also double-checked, & & calendar so small I can barely read it, so l'm & \\
\hline 2 & because when a motion to disqualify comes, & 2 & trying. & \\
\hline 3 & whether of counsel or of a court, if it was a & 3 & So how about the 27th, a week from & \\
\hline 4 & judge, you have to stop and do that without & 4 & Thursday? I have two hours I can give you. & \\
\hline 5 & question. It's a little bit less certain on a & 5 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, I'm leaving & \\
\hline 6 & lawyer, but the word is that it's a better & 6 & for an overseas vacation next Tuesday, so I'm & \\
\hline 7 & practice to dispose of those immediately. & 7 & out till about March 15th. & \\
\hline 8 & I mean, it has to be writing. I don't & 8 & THE COURT: All right. Then we've got to & \\
\hline 9 & think they could ever get it written that & 9 & do this before. So let's see. Let me go back & \\
\hline 10 & quickly that l could get it served on & 10 & to the beginning. & \\
\hline 11 & everybody, so l'm going to have to hear those & 11 & 1 know it's going to be inconvenient, Mr . & \\
\hline 12 & first before I can hear the remaining motions. & 12 & Feaman, but it really would be helpful. And I & \\
\hline 13 & What I will do is, if you tell me, Mr. & 13 & understand it may be an abbreviated way of & \\
\hline 14 & Feaman, how quickly you can get it, I'll set & 14 & doing it. Maybe your assistant can help you. & \\
\hline 15 & this right away. I'll set it now. And l'll & 15 & Is there any way you can get it done by the end & \\
\hline 16 & set the motion to appoint a curator for the & 16 & of the day or first thing in the morning? & \\
\hline 17 & same time. & 17 & I mean, everyone is here. That way I can & \\
\hline 18 & We're leaving enough time so we can hear & 18 & do it tomorrow afternoon. & \\
\hline 19 & the motion to disqualify. And then if it's & 19 & MR. FEAMAN: Okay. & \\
\hline 20 & granted, it's granted. And then we're not & 20 & THE COURT: Okay. Because, I mean, I just & \\
\hline 21 & going to probably be able to go forward on & 21 & don't have time and now that I know that. & \\
\hline 22 & their motion because Ted would be pro se. And & 22 & MR. FEAMAN: We'll try to get it done by & \\
\hline 23 & there is no competing motions, correct? & 23 & noon? & \\
\hline 24 & MR. FEAMAN: Ted is also represented by & 24 & THE COURT: Okay. How about that? & \\
\hline 25 & Mr . Rose here, so he is not without counsel. & 25 & MR. PANKAUSKI: That's fine, Your Honor. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 44 \\
\hline 1 & What time would you like us here tomorrow? & 1 & THE COURT: Well, I might. And I think & \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: Hold on, let me just go back. & 2 & that was brought by Eliot to my attention at & \\
\hline 3 & All right. Two-thirty tomorrow. And you & 3 & some point before today; isn't that true? & \\
\hline 4 & have from 2:30 to 5:00 then. I'll expand the & 4 & MR. BERNSTEIN: No. Well, part of it is, & \\
\hline 5 & time that you had for today. So between the & 5 & but there was an admission to authorities by & \\
\hline 6 & motion to disqualify and then the evidentiary & 6 & Mr. Tescher of alleged, if you believe anything & \\
\hline 7 & hearing on the motion to appoint. & 7 & they say anymore, but that came out that there & \\
\hline 8 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. & 8 & was another document on top of the forged one & \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: Okay. We'll do that all. We & 9 & that also tried to switch beneficiaries. & \\
\hline 10 & have two-and-a-half hours. Does that give you & 10 & Which, by the way, Your Honor, Ted's & \\
\hline 11 & enough time? & 11 & centrally involved in picking all these & \\
\hline 12 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & 12 & attorneys who are bleeding this -- & \\
\hline 13 & THE COURT: You think so, everyone? & 13 & THE COURT: Well, that's what tomorrow's & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir. & 14 & hearing is. Let's not pickpocket yet. & \\
\hline 15 & MR. GLASKO: You said 1:30, Judge? & 15 & Okay. Well, so, I mean, prior hearings & \\
\hline 16 & THE COURT: Two-thirty. & 16 & reveal the issue of forgery, I don't know what & \\
\hline 17 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, may I have permission & 17 & documents, I don't remember them, that existed. & \\
\hline 18 & to appear by phone at the beginning of the & 18 & It may be more than one. & \\
\hline 19 & hearing? I'm coming down at 1:00 o'clock. & 19 & MR. PANKAUSKI: But l'm learning from & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Sure. Yeah, if you'll just & 20 & Mr. Rose and Mr. Bernstein, Ted, is Your Honor & \\
\hline 21 & tell counsel, l'll just call you directly from & 21 & dealt with a back-dated notary clause. & \\
\hline 22 & my office phone until you get here. You don't & 22 & THE COURT: Okay. & \\
\hline 23 & even have to go on CourtCall. & 23 & MR. PANKAUSKI: There is another instance & \\
\hline 24 & All right. So, Mr. Feaman, I'm going to & 24 & of a trust amendment, an entire trust & \\
\hline 25 & give you my fax number. Fax me over a copy of & 25 & amendment, that was evidently fabricated that & \\
\hline & & & & 45 \\
\hline 1 & your motion. & 1 & was disclosed to my client back in January. & \\
\hline 2 & Ready? (561)274-1418. & 2 & THE COURT: All right. & \\
\hline 3 & And really it's right, because now that & 3 & MR. PANKAUSKI: And so my sense is that's & \\
\hline 4 & I'm looking, I have another case where there is & 4 & one of the things that this Court wants to know & \\
\hline 5 & a hearing, an evidentiary hearing set for next & 5 & about. & \\
\hline 6 & Monday, and there is a motion to disqualify & 6 & THE COURT: Well, okay, I'll hear & \\
\hline 7 & counsel and I have that set for Thursday. & 7 & anything that you think on the issue of -- I & \\
\hline 8 & And I remember why I did that, because I & 8 & mean, everyone is in agreement that now that & \\
\hline 9 & thought the better practice was to have that & 9 & Tescher and Spallina are off, someone has to & \\
\hline 10 & done before the hearing on which the matter is & 10 & take their place, true? & \\
\hline 11 & set. & 11 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 12 & So, okay. So file that motion. And then & 12 & THE COURT: I mean, we're not going to & \\
\hline 13 & I'll do both of them and everything else that & 13 & have a vacuum there. So, I mean, this part & \\
\hline 14 & we have to do on this tomorrow starting at & 14 & isn't too complicated. The issues are Ted, & \\
\hline 15 & 2:30. Okay? & 15 & Eliot, or a curator who is not related to those & \\
\hline 16 & All right. Thanks, everybody. & 16 & two? & \\
\hline 17 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, I feel it's & 17 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 18 & important that we disclose something to you. & 18 & THE COURT: So we can get that done & \\
\hline 19 & THE COURT: Okay. & 19 & tomorrow afternoon. & \\
\hline 20 & MR. PANKAUSKI: The reason the personal & 20 & Okay. Thanks. See you then. & \\
\hline 21 & representatives resigned is because, in the & 21 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, -- & \\
\hline 22 & course of this estate administration, evidently & 22 & THE COURT: Yes. & \\
\hline 23 & a fabricated document was discovered. A trust & 23 & MR. GLASKO: -- l'm sorry, l'd like to & \\
\hline 24 & amendment was fabricated. And my sense is Your & 24 & ask. I only have the motions that were heard & \\
\hline 25 & Honor wants to know about that. & 25 & today. I'd just like to ask counsel -- l'll & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    give you my card, because l'd like to ask
    counsel to deliver the motions for tomorrow to
    me tonight, if you'd be so kind.
    MR. PANKAUSKI: Well, he's filing,
    Mr. Feaman is filing the motion for tomorrow.
    MR. GLASKO: Whatever is being heard
    tomorrow.
    THE COURT: Yeah, give him an extra copy
    of the motion -- here, take mine.
    MR. PANKAUSKI: I've got one, Judge.
    THE COURT: The motion for appointment you
    can take. I have Mr. Feaman's response. Do
    you have that already?
    MR. GLASKO: I do not.
    THE COURT: They'll give that to you.
    Thank you very much.
    (The hearing was adjourned.)
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PROBATE DIVISION
CASE NO. 502012CP004391XXXXSB

```

IN RE:

ESTATE OF SIMON L, BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE,
Petitioner,
vs.

TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (and all parties, associates and of counsel); ROBERT L, SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

Respondents.

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARTIN H. COIIN VOLUME II
- -

DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2014

TIME: 2:30 P.M. - 5:03 P.M.

IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA PROBATE DIVISION
CASE NO. 502012CP004391XXXXSB

IN RE:
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Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE,
Petitioner,
vs.
TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (and all parties, associates and of counsel); ROBERT L, SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

\section*{Respondents.}

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN VOLUME II
- - -

DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2014

TIME: 2:30 P.M. - 5:03 P.M.



creditor is not permitted to bring this action. The authority for that -- let me state what the authority is. Privity is required for someone to try to go up to an attorney and say you can't represent Ted Bernstein. There is no privity here. There is no attorney-client relationship between my firm and the creditor, Mr. Stansbury. The authority for that is a 2012 Second District case called THI Holdings, Thomas Howard Indigo Holdings, LLC. And it sets forth that privily is required. It involved a motion to disqualify, a motion for pro hac vice. And it says here as a matter of undisputed facts, there is no privity between the estate and Balassa or his firm. And it goes on to talk about that. And then it says even if the estate could convince this court that it had standing to raise the disqualification issue, it cannot establish the legal requirements for disqualification.

THE COURT: So here's the thing that's concerning me, Mr. Feaman. The allegation, looking at the motion, is that there was -- Im using this expression broadly - some legal dealings between Eliot Bernstein and the Pankauski firm. That's what you allege, correct?

MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
THE COURT: So -- and Eliot Bernstein has not -- and then we also know that Ted Bernstein has hired Mr. Pankauski, that same lawyer that Eliot says he had legal dealings with. True?

MR. FEAMAN: True.
THE COURT: So here's what I'm just not following you -- almost like a matter of logic. With Eliot not complaining, how can a creditor or any other outside person who doesn't claim a conflict of interest -- say I don't want Mr. Pankauski to continue to represent Ted when Eliot has not filed the motion complaining because Eliot is the other purported either prospective or former client, depending upon which rule you look at -- who has a right to either complain or not. So I'm sure it's not the case in reality, but if Eliot didn't complain -- I mean, it could be that Eliot is taking a position, you know, whatever I did with Mr. Pankauski and his firm, you know, it started where it started, ended where it ended, and, you know, it may be that Ted hired him and that's okay with me. And I'm not asking that Mr. Pankauski not represent Ted because of some conflict with me, Eliot. I don't - I just don't
understand how William Stansbury can say there is a confict that Eliot doesn't say exists.

MR. FEAMAN: Mr. Stansbury is harmed as a result of the apparent dereliction of Mr. Pankauski's duties to Mr. Eliot Bernstein because --

THE COURT: Even if Eliot doesn't complain?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. Show me - I need a case that says that that's possible. Because that's what I don't see. Eliot, I think, can complain, and I'm not sure that it's - which rule applies.

MR. FEAMAN: And he may yet complain, we don't know. And I can't --

THE COURT: Right.
MR. FEAMAN: -- speak for Eliot.
THE COURT: I know. Eliot is representing himself.

MR. FEAMAN: Nor do I prepare pleadings for Mr. Bernstein.

THE COURT: Eliot went so far as to sign your verification, but it's not his motion. That's one problem. But also -- I'm almost positive because of some prior cases I had that the person who has to complain is -- about a lawyer representing
someone else, and in this case it's Mr. Pankauski continuing to represent Ted Bernstein, is the person who purportedly is the benefactor of these rules as an either prospective or former client. But if he says no -- if he doesn't seek disqualification, I'm not sure how someone else can - has an interest, under the cases that I read, for that to happen. Let me just look here if there is a case I just saw in my research.

MR. FEAMAN: The court --
THE COURT: I did an extensive case right on Rule 4-1.9, very similar to this, and it was -everyone said it was that rule, not the prospective rule. Although, from reading your motion, it's almost the identical type of case. And both lawyers in that case said, though, that it was the 4-1.9 that applied not the 4-1.8. But the moving party was the alleged aggrieved party who said that they -- that the other lawyer had a conflict of interest because the other lawyer here, Mr. Pankauski, had performed some lawyer-client services, and there was other information that led to the -- because if there is no attorney-client relationship that is complained about that Eliot says was breached, I'm not sure
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behalf of Mr. Stansbury, is that because Eliot Bernstein's interests are more closely aligned with Mr. Stansbury's, and are clearly adverse to Ted Bernstein, and Mr. Stansbury's interests are clearly adverse to Ted Bernstein, that if Eliot Bernstein transmitted information as a prospective client to the attorney who's now Ted Bernstein's lawyer, and we're adverse to him, it's our position that we're harmed as a result of that.

THE COURT: Well -- but it's not harm that's -- the rule is not a harm. The rule is a conflict of interest. And the conflict of interest has to be between Eliot and Ted. I'm not sure how it could be otherwise.

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, as a result of that conflict of interest --

THE COURT: Well, okay. But I still have to --

MR. FEAMAN: -- we're hurt.
THE COURT: But if Eliot says -- because there could be waivers, says here in the rule --4-1.9 says a lawyer who has formerly represented a client shall not thereafter represent another person, okay, unless -- and then there's unlesses [sic] -- and one of those things are clearly in
this case Eliot could not complain about it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: May I interject, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You're objecting?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, can I interject?
THE COURT: What do you want to say?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I politely asked him and told him that he was conflicted, and I felt harmed by it.

THE COURT: That's evidence, though. That's potential evidence you want to interject, but you haven't filed this motion.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't learn that until yesterday, so if I have to, I'll do another day.

THE COURT: So let me ask this. If -- the motion is filed, it's in written form, it's filed by Mr. Stansbury. I think it needs to be joined, if not independently, at least joined by Eliot Bernstein. So what's your position -- and that's clearly what Eliot wants to do, he just doesn't know it yet. What about that, Mr. Pankauski? Can I treat this motion and go forward based upon it being joined by Eliot?

MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. Mr. Eliot

Bernstein received notice of that. He's chosen to go without counsel. He's chosen not to seek any affirmative relief.

THE COURT: But that -- that's to the case. But I'm talking about the motion to disqualify you.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, that's what I am speaking about.

THE COURT: So I mean -- I could do one of two things. I can tell Eliot go over to the library and start writing out -- Xeroxing this motion, sign it yourself, and bring it in, and then, you know --

MR. PANKAUSKI: You just want an oral joinder right now?

THE COURT: Yeah --
MR. PANKAUSKI: That's fine.
THE COURT: - that's what I'm getting at.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes. Sorry, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. What's your position on that?

MR. PANKAUSKI: But Mr. Stansbury can't do it. Eliot could do it.

THE COURT: I think Eliot needs to be the complaining party. Now, I'm not saying you can't

THE COURT: So come on up and sit here so I can look at you and Judge your credibility when I hear things that are going on. So sit right there in the middle.

So whether -- again, I'm not -- l'm not sure, I won't know til the end, what rule I think this comes under, but it looks like it's either 1-9 -- or 1.9 or 1.18 , but it sounds like it's one of those two.

So, okay, so you're up first.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you. I would call Mr. Eliot Bernstein to the stand.

THE COURT: I figured that would be first. Okay. Come on, Eliot.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Opening statements.
THE COURT: He has a right to opening. So have a seat here and I'll let Mr. Pankauski finish his opening.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Thanks, Judge. And I -okay. Thank you, Your Honor. So concisely, we are traveling -- and I agree with Mr. Stansbury's counsel -- under 4-1.18. The evidence is going to show that my firm never had an attorney-client relationship with Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

And if I may, let's just -- we've dealt
with the standing issue of Mr. Stansbury. You know, I'm of the position he does not have standing. I'm also of the position that Eliot lacks standing to participate in this estate administration. He's not a beneficiary under the decedent's will. He's not a beneficiary under the decedent's revocable trust.

I do recognize that I'm coming in late to this estate administration.

Eliot Bernstein is not an interested person in this estate. He shouldn't even be here.

Sol need to --
THE COURT: What is Eliot Bernstein other than the brother of Ted?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Nothing.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PANKAUSKI: I mean, if this was a guardianship, he may have standing to come in and participate in the administration of his dad's person and property, but it's an estate. He totally lacks standing. And because he lacks standing, he doesn't -- he's not an interested person and can't come in and tell Ted Bernstein who he can hire as an attorney for an estate
administration
And that's my third point, Your Honor. This isn't an adverse lawsuit. This isn't a personal injury case. Mr. Ted Bernstein has asked Your Honor if he can administer this estate. He wants to be a fiduciary. As he is a fiduciary --

THE COURT: Okay. But the participation of Ted is not questioned. It's whether you can do it for him.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood.
THE COURT: So Ted is -- no one is suggesting Ted is not eligible to request that he be a PR or curator. I mean, that wasn't objected to yesterday.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood. And so, if I may, let me go to the standard that we're traveling under today and what we should be doing here. Because we are going to introduce evidence that there was no attorney-client relationship. Evidence is going to be introduced that there was no confidential information that Eliot Bernstein conveyed to my law firm. The evidence is going to show that he called up trying to find an attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice regarding some
estate matters of his parents.
I'm going to testify about
Mr. Bernstein's -- excuse me -- about Mr. Stansbury's verified motion. I'm going to testify as to what Mr. Stansbury's counsel told me out there yesterday when you asked me to step out. And I'm going to demonstrate the amazing amount of inconsistencies in this fiction that we had an attorney-client relationship, or there is some type of confidential information that is going to be adverse to Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

So it's a three-fold test or three-prong test, Your Honor. For you to disqualify this firm -- for you to say Ted Bernstein, you can not hire the Pankauski law firm for estate administration. You would have first to make a finding of fact that the interests of Ted Bernstein are materially adverse, not just adverse, but materially adverse to the prospective client, Eliot Bernstein.

The second thing that you would need to find is that I received confidential information from Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

And then the third thing that you would
have to find is that I am going to use that information, that confidential information, to the disadvantage of Mr. Eliot Bernstein in an estate.

THE COURT: That you are going to or could?
I mean, it couldn't be going to --
MR. PANKAUSKI: That I could. Thank you, Your Honor.

So that's the standard under 4-1.18. What does our Fourth District say about this?

THE COURT: I kind of want opening and not closing. So I got that part.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Okay. So the standard that I
would direct our attention to is the Coolis
(phonetic) case. You would need to find -- and again, it's a finding of fact - - that I had actual knowledge of material confidential information. What the Fourth has described as protected information. The burden is on Eliot.

Finally, because disqualification of a party's counsel is such an egregious punishment, that we can't resort to speculation. Mr. Eliot Bernstein needs to prove by a greater weight of the evidence those three prongs that I described in 4-1.18.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's get the evidence. Then we can talk about the law once we see what the evidence is.

Okay. Raise your right hand.
(Thereupon, ELIOT BERNSTEIN was duly sworn
by the court)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Thank you. Please state your name.
A Eliot Ivan Bernstein.
Q Your residence address?
A 2753 NW 34th Street, Boca Raton, Florida.
Q And you are the son of the late Simon
Bernstein?
A lam.
Q And you reside in Florida presently?
A Ido.
Q And are your children beneficiaries under the
estate as it presently is structured?
A I'm not a hundred percent sure at this point.
Q Okay.
A Ibelieve Iam.
THE COURT: So do this, though. That may be true, but lel's make sure you're asked a question,
don't volunteer, because that's important. Okay. THE WITNESS: Sure.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q is your brother Ted Bernstein presently a
beneficiary under the trust established by the estate
documents, if you know?
A Idon't believe so.
Q That would be Ted Bernstein?
A That would be.
Q And are your interests with Ted Bernstein
adverse in connection with the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A Yes, sir.
Q And how so?
A Well, I'm pursuing Ted in a number of legal actions, criminal actions, for --

THE COURT: So focus on the question. Okay.
He didn't ask anything about criminal actions.
So, you know, you're a witness now --
THE WITNESS: We're adverse to each other.
THE COURT: You need to pay - let me finish -- you need to pay attention carefully to the question. Listen. Let me finish.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Okay. And not ramble outside the scope of the question. Because Mr. Feaman's
questions are designed to be tailormade for this case.

Go ahead.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Thank you, Your Honor.
How is your interest in the estate of your
father directly, or through the trust, established by
your father's will, in conflict with that of Ted
Bernstein?
A I believe we're at conflict because Ted and I
differ if Ted and his children are part of the estates.
Q Okay. And what do you believe -- what is your
understanding, as you sit here today, as to whether Ted
and his children -- whether they should inherit under the
estate, what is your understanding?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection. Lack of foundation.

THE COURT: I'll let you cross on that, or it
may be brought out by his answer. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe they should be.
BY MR. FEAMAN
And have you had discussions with Ted
concerning this?
A Yes.
Q And has Ted Bernstein disagreed with you?
```

    A Yes.
    Q How so? What has he indicated to you?
    A He believes his children should be included
    in the estate.
Q Do you disagree with that?
A Ido.
Q And did you, in September of last year,
approach, with your wife, the law offices of
Mr. Pankauski?
A Yes, sir.
Q Do you recall about when that was?
A September 20th or so, around that area.
Q And was the approach in person or by phone?
A Byphone.
Q Okay. And who called?
A I believe my wife initiated the call.
Q Okay. Were you present when she made the phone
call?
A I don't believe so.
Q Okay. And how long did she -- withdrawn. As a
result of that phone call, was there an e-mail sent to
your -- to Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes,sir.
Q Do you know to whom it was sent?
A I believe to Mr. Pankauski and his assistant,
Michelle Morley.
MR. PANKAUSKI:Objection, speculation. He's
believing.
THE COURT: Okay. Try to avoid belief, tell
me what you know. Can you reanswer?
THE WITNESS: Yes. We sent information to
both Mr. Pankauski and his assistant.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q And were you -- did your wife send an e-mail as
a follow-up to that telephone conversation?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And were you copied on that e-mail?
A Yes
Q Okay.Let me show you what's been marked as
Exhibit A, ask you if this is a true copy of the e-mail
that was sent by your wife, in which you were copied,
after the initial conversation that she had with
Mr. Pankauski's office?
THE COURT: So just -- because I think I have
the Exhibit A at the top part of that doesn't
apply, correct? Because that's February 10th.
MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
THE COURT:So if the other -- your question
is, what did Candice send. But this is an e-mail
from Michelle.So it doesn't -- the e-mail

```
```

A He believes his children should be included
in the estate.
Q Do you disagree with that?
A Ido.
Q And did you, in September of last year,
approach, with your wife, the law offices of
Mr. Pankauski?
A Yes, sir.
A September 20th or so, around that area.
Q And was the approach in person or by phone?
A By phone.
Q Okay. And who called?
A I believe my wife initiated the call.
Q Okay. Were you present when she made the phone
call?
A I don't believe so.
Q Okay. And how long did she -- withdrawn. As a
result of that phone call, was there an e-mail sent to
your -- to Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes, sir.
A I believe to Mr. Pankauski and his assistant,
MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection, speculation. He's
believing.
THE COURT: Okay. Try to avoid belief, tell me what you know. Can you reanswer?
THE WITNESS: Yes. We sent information to both Mr. Pankauski and his assistant.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q And were you -- did your wife send an e-mail as
follow-up to that telephone conversation?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And were you copied on that e-mail?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Let me show you what's been marked as
Exhibit $A$, ask you if this is a true copy of the e-mail
that was sent by your wife, in which you were copied,
after the initial conversation that she had with
Mr. Pankauski's office?
THE COURT: So just -- because I think I have
the Exhibit A at the top part of that doesn't apply, correct? Because that's February 10th.
MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
THE COURT: So if the other -- your question
from Michelle. So it doesn't -- the e-mail

```
doesn't fit the question.
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Thank you. Hold on. BY MR. FEAMAN

Q Are you aware that your wife sent an e-mail to
Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes.
Q And after that e-mail, did you personally have
a conversation with Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes.
Q With whom did you speak?
A Mr. Pankauski.
Q Directly?
A Yes.
Q Was this by telephone?
A Yes.
Q For how long?
A An hour or so.
Q Was this shortly after -- or within a few days after the e-mail was sent by your wife?

A Yes, sir.
Q And was he in possession of documents that had
been transmitted by your wife to him?
A Yes, sir.
Q And did you discuss with Mr. Pankauski anything
that you would consider to be confidential?

A Yeah, confidential and adverse to the information about my brother.

Q Like what?
A Like what we thought about my brother's
actions with the other attorneys. The fact that there
was forgery going on. We believed he was working with
the attorneys who resigned yesterday, Tescher and
Spallina. That Tescher and Spallina had brought them
in, had business dealings, et cetera. We gave him a
lot of confidential information, I feel.
Q Did you discuss Mr. Pankauski's law firm
representing you?
A Yes, sir.
Q And was a retainer asked for?
A It was.
Q And what were the terms of the retainer that
you recall?
A To -- he wanted us to pay money and to retain
his services. And we couldn't afford it. And I
basically told him we couldn't afford it.
THE COURT: That's not the question.
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Yeah, a retainer was
sought.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Was a retainer discussed?
```

    A Yes, sir.
    Q And was it an amount of money that you didn't
    presently have at that time?
A Yes.
Q And did you set about to try to obtain the
retainer?
A I told him I would try to get it from the
court, and make a petition to the court, which I filed
with the court. And I've been waiting for an answer on
that. And then I would have called him back and got
the money for him.
Q All right. Did you ever receive any
communication from Mr. Pankauski saying he was
affirmatively not going to represent you?
A No.
Q When did you hear that Mr. Pankauski had been
retained by Mr. Ted Bernstein?
A Oh, week or two ago.
Q And did you review the notice of appearance
that was filed by Mr. Pankauski in this case?
A Idid.
Q When did you receive that?
A Oh, no, I don't think I've ever reviewed a
notice of appearance from him.
Q Okay. And when you found out that

```
Mr. Pankauski was coming in on behalf of Mr. Ted
Bernstein, what was your reaction?
    A I contacted him and said that I felt that he
was conflicted. And -- that was the first contact.
    Q Did you send him an e-mail in that regard?
    A Idid.
    Q And did you express any desire that he not
represent Mr. Bernstein?
    A Yes, sir.
    Q Okay. And what was his response?
    A He didn't see eye to eye with me, basically.
I sent him then the Bar rules that I felt applied, as a
foliow-up e-mail. Then, you know, I figured I'd come
here and talk to the judge or something.
    Q So this motion is not something that you have
expressed to Mr. Pankauski prior to today, is that
correct?
    A No. No, I asked him politely to disqualify,
you know, under ethical rules.
    Q Okay. And, obviously, you felt that request
was rejected, correct?
    A Correct. He's here.
    Q How do you feel as a result of his continuing
this case in terms of your personal involvement in this
case?

1 A Violated, you know.
Q What is it?
A Violated.
Q Why?
A Because it's a big risk. You know, he was also referred to me by Joel Weissman, who has very
intimate knowledge of our case and what's going on in
my life, and information regarding my brother. And
I've had conversations with Mr. Weissman about that.
And he was trying to help me out. And I, you know, I
feel violated, that's all I can say.
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. No further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Bernstein.
A Good afternoon, sir.
Q In addition to contacting my law firm, you
contacted Joel Weissman's law firm?
A Joel Weissman was referred to us.
\(Q\) Is that a yes?
A Yes.
Q And you contacted Norman Fleisher?
A I might have.
Q You did contact Norman Fleisher?
A Are you telling me I did?
Q I'm asking you.
A No, you were telling me. But I don't know.
Who is Norman Fleisher?
Q And you contacted attorney Amy Beller?
A I might have.
Q And you contacted Brandon Pratt?
MR. FEAMAN: Outside the scope of direct.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I retained Brandon Pratt.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Please tell us what other --
A The children retained Brandon Pratt.
Q Your children are minors, correct?
A Yes.
Q Please tell us who the other attorneys in Palm
Beach County are that you contacted regarding this
matter?
A No.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, the witness is
refusing to answer my question and he hasn't --
THE COURT: I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: I answered. I said no.
THE COURT: I thought he said none.
THen

A Are you telling me I did?

A No, you were telling me. But I don't know.
Who is Norman Fleisher?
Q And you contacted attorney Amy Beller?
A I might have.
Q And you contacted Brandon Pratt?
MR. FEAMAN: Outside the scope of direct.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I retained Brandon Pratt.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Please tell us what other --
A The children retained Brandon Pratt.
Q Your children are minors, correct?
A Yes.
Q Please tell us who the other attorneys in Palm
Beach County are that you contacted regarding this
matter?
A No.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, the witness is refusing to answer my question and he hasn't --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: I answered. I said no.
THE COURT: I thought he said none.

```

    Q You are not mentioned in the will as a
    beneficiary?
A Which will?
Q Your dad's will. The one that's before this
court
A I don't believe so.
Q May I approach the witness with a copy of
Simon's will?
THE COURT: You're allowed to do that.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Would you like to take a look at it. If you
can just look through your dad, Simon's, will, which I
just handed to you, can you just confirm, please, that
you are not a beneficiary under your dad's will?
A I was convinced under this one I wasn't. But
I was told by Spallina and Tescher that I was a
personal property beneficiary or something.
Q So, you know, are you a beneficiary under your
dad's will that I just handed to you?
THE COURT: So the date of the will?
MR. FEAMAN: Objection, asked and answered.
THE COURT: Yeah. Sustained. Date of the
will?
MR. PANKAUSKI:The date of the will is
July 20 -- looks like first -- }2012

```
THE COURT: Okay. Next question
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q And you are not a beneficiary of your father,
Simon's, revocable trust?
    A l've never seen that. That's been withheld
and suppressed and denied by former counsel --
    THE COURT: So is the answer I don't know?
    THE WITNESS: No, it's l've never seen it.
        THE COURT: Okay. Straight answer, we'll
    move through this.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q Your testimony is you've never seen your dad,
Simon's, revocable trust?
    A That's correct.
    Q Do you have Exhibit \(A\) in front of you that
Mr. Feaman asked you about earlier?
    A No.
    Q And Exhibit A was attached to the verified
motion filed by Mr. Stansbury?
    A No.
    Q Okay. May I approach the witness?
        THE COURT: Yeah.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q I'm going to hand you my verified motion and
I'm going to ask you to direct your attention to Exhibit

1 A. Do you see that that looks like an e-mail from your
wife Candice?
A Yes, sir.
THE COURT: No, that's --but that's on
February 10th. Is that what you're getting at? MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, the date doesn't matter. THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q What is mentioned in line item three?
A Copies of revised wills, trusts for Simon
Bernstein.
Q Thank you.
A That means it's an amended and restated trust
of Simon, not the trust of Simon that you asked about,
just for your edification.
Q And, in fact, his amended trust is your dad's last trust, correct?

A If you believe what they are saying.
Q So you have seen your dad's trust?
A No, l've never seen my dad's trust. I've
seen an amended and restated trust. The original
trust, I believe, has me and my two sisters as
beneficiary, and Ted and his children wholly excluded
with my sister Pam as the only non-beneficiaries in this whole thing.

2 to me, Pankauski, and my assistant. Do you recall that
testimony?
A I believe it was my wife sent an e-mail to your firm.

Q Yes. But l'd like to correct that.
A Okay.
Q Your wife Candice sent an e-mail to my
assistant, not to me?
A Correct.
Q And my assistant followed up with Candice by e-mail?

A Well, actually, you requested that your
assistant get the documents for your meeting with me.
That's how I recall it. Candice came and asked me, and
we sent you the information to your assistant for your
review for our meeting because you were in California
or something.
Q Let's be clear. l've never spoken to your wife Candice?

A Correct.
Q I have never asked Candice for any documents?
A Except your assistant asked Candice for
documents for our meeting, correct.
Q Correct. You said that you had one
```

conversation with me for an hour or so. Do you remember
that testimony?
A Yeah. And I believe it was two conversations
I had with you total.
Q Now, it's two conversations?
A Yeah. You called me back to tell me you had
found a way to pay for your bill.
Q And when were those two conversations?
A September something. I don't have it in
front of me today. I can check my calendar.
Q Do you have your calendar with you?
A Idon't.
Q Okay. And how far apart were those two
conversations?
A Shortly thereafter, I believe.
Q And they were in the evening, right?
A I believe.
Q Both of them were?
A I believe.
Q And you said the first one lasted an hour or
so. Do you recall how long this supposed second
conversation lasted?
A I believe it was rather brief.
Q Less than five minutes?
A Maybe more.

```

Q And I asked you for -- your belief is that I
asked you for a \(\$ 200,000\) retainer?
A No. My belief --
THE COURT: No. No. Wait. Next question.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Isn't it your belief that -- strike that.
What's your understanding of how much 1 asked for a
retainer?
A I don't recall the exact amount for the
retainer.
THE COURT: Then stop. That's your answer.
Next question.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q You sent me an e-mail on February 10th?
A Correct.
Q Okay. May I approach the witness. And this is
a copy of the February 10 th e-mail that you sent to me,
correct?
A Correct.
MR. FEAMAN: Do you have another copy of
that?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yeah, I should.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q And while I'm looking, could you just please
read that, Mr. Bernstein?
A Mr. Pankauski --
Q No, I'm sorry, I meant just read it to
yourself, so...
A All right.
MR. PANKAUSKI: I'm sorry, I don't. I
should, but I don't. If you'd like to come over here, you're more than welcome to look at it with me.

MR. FEAMAN: May I approach the witness? THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Do you see about -- in your e-mail -- one, two,
three, four, five, six --bless you, Mr. Rose -- seven
lines up from the bottom?
A Correct.
Q You see that as of February 10th,
Mr. Bernstein, your story was that I proposed a retainer
of \(\$ 200,000\) ?
A Correct.
Q Okay. So let me go on from there. You were
asked whether you had -- whether you discussed
confidential information to me, and you said yes?
A Correct.
Q And you said that it involved forgery and

Tescher and Spallina, correct?
A Yes.
Q Any other confidential information?
A Yeah, all kinds of stuff.
Q Okay.
A We talked about in the course of our
conversation about you representing us.
Q Well, please tell us what that is.
A You know, I believe we spoke mainly about the
problems in the estate with the forgeries and the
notary public, the police investigations that we were
launching against Ted, Tescher, et cetera. I believe
we talked about the various aspects of our legal
strategy in, you know, against the estates and Ted, et
cetera, and were looking to retain you.
Q Is your testimony that you and I had a conversation about a legal strategy against the estate?

A Against -- yes, against the estates, and the people in charge, Tescher, Spallina, the personal representatives, getting rid of them, et cetera.

Q And is it your testimony that I discussed trial
strategy with you about suing your brother Ted?
A Removing the personal representative and Ted
from having any interest in the estates.
Q I had a discussion with you about removing

Ted's interest in your dad's estate?
A In all the estates.
Q Okay.
A That I told you I believe these documents of
2012 were forged and fraudulent and that we had
evidence, you know, I went into all that.
Q Sir, do we agree Ted is not a beneficiary of your dad's estate and that there would be nothing to remove him from?

A It's his children, excuse me.
Q Isn't it true that you spoke to me about filing a malpractice action?

A Excuse me, let me correct that. I did want you to remove Ted. Because Ted was representing that he was trustee of this trust of my father's. And I expressed to you that he hadn't sent out the proper forms. He hadn't followed any of the rules. And that he was acting in bad faith as an alleged fiduciary under alleged documents.

Q You spoke to me about a potential malpractice action against Don Tescher?

A That was only a small part.
Q In fact, you told me that you --
A Excuse me, in fact, you are the one -- we just told you that you should fund your bill from

Kimberly Moran's forgery and fraud, which Mr. Tescher
and Spallina were responsible under Florida law for the
acts of their notary who committed postmortem forgery
of my father's signature, et cetera.
Q You told me that you had been looking for a
lawyer to sue Mr. Tescher, but you couldn't find one?
A Did I?
Q Well, that's my question to you.
A Oh, that was a statement.
THE COURT: He asked you the question. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: What was the -- how --
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q You told me that you were trying to find an attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice?

A No.
Q You didn't tell me that you were looking for an attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice? What did you tell me about the malpractice?

A Well, you contacted me and said --
THE COURT: Listen to the question.
THE WITNESS: Okay. In regards to the malpractice, I said that case against Tescher and Spallina should be the point of funding for an attorney to get their fees paid for.

BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q So you and I did discuss malpractice against
Mr. Tescher?
A Correct.
Q Okay. When I asked you about confidential
information a moment ago, you were talking about some
criminal inquiries, you were talking about some
forgeries. You and I discussed a postdated or backdated
notary clause?
A No.
Q We didn't discuss a notary clause that was
presented to this court whose notary seal was improper?
A Not only the notary seal, but the signatures.
Q Okay. So forgive me. You and I had a
discussion about a deficient notary clause, correct?
A A forgery and deficient notary on a forged
document, yes.
Q Correct. And when you spoke with me in
September of 2013, the notary clause information was
already before this court?
A Part of it.
Q Yeah, it was public information?
A Some of it.
Q And the criminal matters that you're talking
about, those were - there was already an ongoing
investigation by the time you and I chatted in September
of 2013?
A And I don't know if anybody else knew about
that, et cetera.
Q Is that a yes?
A Yes. There were several investigations
going.
THE COURT: Try not to volunteer,
Mr. Bernstein.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q The matters that you spoke to me about in
September of 2013, you had spoken to -- you had spoken
about with other individuals?
A I had.
Q And, in fact, most of that information was
public record because much of it was going on right here
in this estate proceeding?
A No.
Q What wasn't a public record?
A I don't want to disclose it. I mean, it was
confidential information I gave you at the time.
That's -- I still feel it's confidential and feel that
I'm -- you might be exposing that stuff.
Q What's the confidential information?
A Just information about the documents we're



\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & 119 \\
\hline 1 & THE WITNESS: Sorry. & & give -- the weight I give it, I'm not sure. If & \\
\hline 2 & MR. FEAMAN: Without a date, Your Honor, you & 2 & there is an issue about when it was sent. So do & \\
\hline 3 & can't connect confidential - he's offering it for & 3 & you remember when you sent this e-mail? & \\
\hline 4 & the purpose that somehow it was -- & 4 & THE WITNESS: Looks like maybe shortly after & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: First thing is to identify it. I & 5 & December 26 in response to letters from Tescher & \\
\hline 6 & haven't determined more than that right now. So & 6 & and Spallina that are attached. & \\
\hline 7 & this is -- it's being shown to Eliot Bernstein, & 7 & THE COURT: Of what year? & \\
\hline 8 & purportedly, to be an e-mail from him to others. & 8 & THE WITNESS: 2013. & \\
\hline 9 & MR. FEAMAN: Correct. & 9 & THE COURT: Okay. All right. So objection & \\
\hline 10 & THE WITNESS: Well, now that it's missing the & 10 & overruled. This is Number 4. & \\
\hline 11 & date, I would say it's not my e-mail. & 11 & (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 4 was marked in & \\
\hline 12 & THE COURT: Okay. So are you sure you want & 12 & evidence) & \\
\hline 13 & me to believe that part of your testimony? Listen & 13 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, may I get that & \\
\hline 14 & to me carefully. Because if I don't believe it, & 14 & copy back and use this one? & \\
\hline 15 & I'm likely not to believe anything else you say. & 15 & THE COURT: All right. & \\
\hline 16 & THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll believe it. & 16 & MR. PANKAUSKI: I'll stamp it. & \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: Look at the e-mail. Let's not & 17 & THE COURT: Okay. & \\
\hline 18 & play games with me. & 18 & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 19 & THE WITNESS: I'm not. & 19 & Q Mr. Bernstein, would you be good enough to turn & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Well, that was a game playing -- & & to Page 2, please? & \\
\hline 21 & THE WITNESS: Well, I notice right off the & & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 22 & bat my normal stamp on my e-mails isn't here. & 22 & Q And so you see on Page 2 that in this & \\
\hline 23 & That scared me. Sol said -- & & communication to all these people, this e-mail? & \\
\hline 24 & THE COURT: So is I-V-I-E-W-I-T -- & 24 & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 25 & THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. That's all good. & 25 & Q You're discussing forgery and fraud? & \\
\hline & & & & 120 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: I mean, that's you, right? I & & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 2 & mean, if we go ahead and pull your hard drive, & 2 & Q And you're discussing wills and trusts of & \\
\hline 3 & will we find this e-mail? & 3 & Simon's estate, correct? & \\
\hline 4 & THE WITNESS: No. No. We can go on that & 4 & A Well, this is all after our conversation by a & \\
\hline 5 & assumption. & & long time, I believe. & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: Okay. That's -- okay. All & 6 & \(Q\) Is that a yes? & \\
\hline 7 & right. But I don't know the date of it, and you & 7 & A Yes. & \\
\hline 8 & can ask questions about that. But the subject is & 8 & Q And you're discussing a power of appointment, & \\
\hline 9 & response to Ted and Donald letters, re, emergency & & right? & \\
\hline 10 & distributions. And then there's a whole bunch of & 10 & A Yes. & \\
\hline 11 & other things there. Okay. And then there's some & 11 & Q And you're talking about grandchildren and & \\
\hline 12 & other dates that are in the body of this exhibit. & & beneficiaries, correct? & \\
\hline 13 & So Mr. Feaman, your objection is what? & 13 & A Correct. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Without an establishment of a & 14 & Q And if you turn back to one, you sent this to & \\
\hline 15 & date on the e-mail it has no probative value as to & & attorney Mark Manceri? & \\
\hline 16 & whether the communications that Eliot made with & 16 & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Pankauski in September were confidential or & 17 & Q And you sent it to attorney Caroline Rogers? & \\
\hline 18 & not. & 18 & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 19 & THE COURT: Okay. So let me think about & 19 & Q Mark Garber? & \\
\hline 20 & that. I'm looking here at the documents and & 20 & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 21 & they -- that are contained in this e-mail -- and & 21 & Q You sent it to lawyers at Plaster Greenberg? & \\
\hline 22 & there are a bunch of dates there. I see 2012, & 22 & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 23 & 2013 dates, court proceedings before me at some & 23 & Q In fact, you sent it to, what, a dozen or so & \\
\hline 24 & point in 2013. And so admissibility versus & & attorneys? & \\
\hline 25 & weight -- it's admissible. I mean, I may have to & 25 & A Yes, sir. & \\
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\hline 1 Q Okay. & 1 & done this before and you're experienced in this. & \\
\hline 2 THE COURT: I need the Exhibit 4 so I can see & 2 & I've warned you -- & \\
\hline 3 it. As well as the other exhibits if you've & 3 & THE WITNESS: I have never done it. & \\
\hline 4 stamped them. & 4 & THE COURT: Listen to the question. Okay. & \\
\hline 5 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, 1 think we did. I'll & 5 & You don't understand the question, ask that it be & \\
\hline 6 complete them before we leave. & 6 & repeated. Mr. Feaman is a really good trial & \\
\hline 7 Thank you. & 7 & lawyer. He's not objecting. That means it's a & \\
\hline 8 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & 8 & proper question. And limit your answer to the & \\
\hline 9 Q Mr. Bernstein, just a couple questions about & 9 & question. But when you do a narrative, I block it & \\
\hline 10 your interest in this estate of your father. You & 10 & out. I don' pay attention to anything you're & \\
\hline 11 mentioned that -- I believe you testified that you & 11 & saying. You are not helping your cause. You're & \\
\hline 12 believe you inherit from your dad Simon's estate, is that & 12 & hurting yourself. & \\
\hline 13 accurate. & 13 & THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, it's my first time & \\
\hline 14 A Ido. & 14 & ever being -- & \\
\hline 15 Q Okay. And you don't want to have Ted be the & 15 & THE COURT: So it's your first time wanting & \\
\hline 16 personal representative of the curator because your & 16 & to hurt yourself. & \\
\hline 17 interests are adverse to Ted's? & 17 & THE WITNESS: No, now that you've explained & \\
\hline 18 A And because Ted's been involved in a lot of & 18 & it -- & \\
\hline 19 confidential information, I discussed with you on the & 19 & THE COURT: So your answer is stricken. If & \\
\hline 20 phone. & 20 & the reporter will read back the question, we can & \\
\hline 21 Q The truth is, is that you've asked Ted for & 21 & get a clean answer. And don't give a rambling & \\
\hline 22 money to live on and Ted won't give you that money? & 22 & narrative, please. & \\
\hline 23 A That's your interpretation. & 23 & THE WITNESS: Okay, I apologize. & \\
\hline 24 THE COURT: Listen to the question. Try to & 24 & (Record read) & \\
\hline 25 answer it. & 25 & THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline & & & 124 \\
\hline 1 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & 1 & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 2 Q Yes or no? Is that a yes? & 2 & Q And Ted's refused to? & \\
\hline 3 A I have been forced to ask Ted, yes. & 3 & A No. & \\
\hline 4 Q You've asked Ted to pay your -- the expenses of & 4 & Q Okay. You've asked your brother Ted to pay & \\
\hline 5 your residence? & & your children's tuition? & \\
\hline 6 A What happened was -- & 6 & A l've asked him to pay the expenses of & \\
\hline 7 THE COURT: No. No. Listen. Stop. Stop. & 7 & Bernstein Family Realty and the welfare -- & \\
\hline 8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. & 8 & THE COURT: No. No. See, he didn't ask you & \\
\hline 9 THE COURT: Listen. Your question has to be & 9 & about that. & \\
\hline 10 narrow to the -- your answer has to be narrow to & 10 & MR. FEAMAN: Wait. I have to object to the & \\
\hline 11 the -- & 11 & form. And it doesn't define Ted in what capacity. & \\
\hline 12 THE WITNESS: I was directed to Ted to pay & 12 & THE COURT: I don't know that I need a & \\
\hline 13 those bills. & 13 & capacity for that question. It's a little & \\
\hline 14 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & 14 & different type of question. So the objection is & \\
\hline 15 Q And Ted has refused? & 15 & overruled. But, again, Eliot, listen to the & \\
\hline 16 A Ted has denied that Janet Craig at & 16 & question. Answer it as asked. & \\
\hline 17 Oppenheimer directed that he volunteer to pay the & 17 & Go ahead. Let's read it back. & \\
\hline 18 bills. And I was supposed to deal with Ted only, since & 18 & (Record read) & \\
\hline 19 she had -- he had volunteered to become manager of a & 19 & THE WITNESS: Yes. & \\
\hline 20 company which he didn't have legal rights to and she & 20 & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 21 didn't have the -- & & Q You are not currently employed? & \\
\hline 22 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. & 22 & A No, I am currently employed. & \\
\hline 23 THE WITNESS: Sorry, Your Honor. & 23 & Q Where are you employed? & \\
\hline 24 THE COURT: Your answer is stricken. So, & 24 & MR. FEAMAN: Relevancy. & \\
\hline 25 Eliot, here's the last - you know, I mean, you've & 25 & THE COURT: Yeah, tell me the relevancy. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}







way compromises his position or materially disadvantages
him when you will be representing Ted as the beneficiary
in these matters?
A Absolutely not.
Q Do you anticipate there being some litigation
in this trust?
A Yeah, I do, on the trust. Not necessarily
the estate. In the trust. I think that Ted is going
to file a dec action and ask Judge Colin for
instructions on how property under the trust should be
distributed or not distributed.
Q And as counsel, is it your intention to file a
dec action and follow the instructions of the court?
A Absolutely.
MR. ROSE: I have nothing further, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Feaman.
MR. FEAMAN: I'll try to be as brief as I
can.
THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q If I understood your testimony, Mr. Pankauski, are you taking the position that there is a difference between documents received by your office that you didn't
see and, therefore, you didn't see those documents? Are you making a distinction?

A Yeah. The only distinction I'm making is in the testimony from Mr. Eliot Bernstein; he said that he sent me documents. He didn't. His wife sent documents to my intake person.

Q All right. And so you are taking the position
that, therefore, you didn't see them?
A No, my position is I didn't read them. There is no therefore. I didn't read those documents that he
sent -- that Candice sent to my intake person.
Q You don't deny your office received them?
A No, not at all.
Q And you are familiar, I would assume, with Rule
of Professional Conduct 4-5.3 (c) which states that although paralegals or legal assistants may perform the duties delegated to them by the lawyer without the presence or active involvement of the lawyer, the lawyer shall review and be responsible for the work product of paralegals or legal assistants? You would agree with that, correct?

A For existing clients, absolutely. Not for prospective clients. There is no duty on my behalf to review any number of things that come in from dozens of prospects.

Q Now, the - you actually spoke to this
particular prospective client, correct?
A Yes.
Q And you would agree with me that Mr. Eliot
Bernstein was, in fact, a prospective client, correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. You said the focus was on Don Tescher.
But could you take a look at Exhibit 3?
A Sure.
Q That's your rejection letter right there?
A Yes.
Q The reference makes no reference to
Mr . Tescher, does it? It says, Estate of Shirley
Bernstein and Estate of Simon Bernstein, correct?
A Yes.
Q Only. And the documents that you received,
which are shown on Exhibit 2, which was the e-mail from
Candice Bernstein to Michelle of your office -- by the
way, how long has she worked for you?
A Oh, Michelle has been with us probably three to four years.

Q Okay. And you received documents that included the Shirley Bernstein trust, the Shirley Bernstein will, back to 2008, correct?

A Michelle from my law office received those

1 documents on Exhibit 2.
Q Okay. And the Simon Bernstein Amended Trust of
2012, correct?
A Yes.
Q Have you now seen the Simon Bernstein original
trust? Before it was allegedly amended in 2012?
A The 2008?
Q I don't know.
A Yeah, when you say original, I don't know
what you mean by that.
Q Okay.
A I looked at Mr --
Q The trust which this amendment purportedly

\section*{amends?}

A I don't know if l've looked at it. I've
looked at Simon Bernstein's trust that Mr. Rose gave
me, 1 believe it's the 2012 document.
Q Now, you said you were familiar with the estate
plan. And all of the documents that are listed here
would be necessary documents that would make you familiar
with the estate plan, correct?
A Necessary, no. I believe the 2012 trust
amendment revokes all prior amendments, which would
make prior ones a non-issue.
Q There is also documents here that have no
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 157 & \\
\hline 1. relationship to the -- as far as you can tell -- the & 1 Bernstein. \\
\hline 2 estate plan, like the Bernstein Holdings, LLC? & 2 Q So even though you didn't learn about it then, \\
\hline 3 A I don't think that's accurate. It's my & 3 they still sent to you the Bernstein Holdings, LLC for a \\
\hline 4 understanding from Ted Bernstein and Mr. Rose that & 4 reason I guess you have no idea, is that right? \\
\hline 5 Bernstein Holdings, LLC was an entity that Simon & 5 A Yeah. I don't know why Eliot's wife, \\
\hline 6 created to own a house that Eliot lives in. So where & 6 Candice, sent Michelle Bernstein Holdings, LLC other \\
\hline 7 Eliot lives, that's actually owned by an LLC created by & 7 than she wanted someone to review them. \\
\hline 8 his dad, Simon. And the members of the LLC are three & 8 Q That's certainly -- I'm sorry, I don't mean to \\
\hline 9 trusts. Sol think that's all part of Simon's estate & 9 interrupt -- \\
\hline 10 plan, you know, that's one way he helped out Eliot. & 10 A That's all right, you're doing a great job. \\
\hline 11 Q By your cross-examination of Mr. Eliot & 11 You know, when prospective probate clients call you, \\
\hline 12 Bernstein, when you asked about whether he had asked Ted & 12 they won't do a document dump. They want to open up, \\
\hline 13 Bernstein for money, that would be money that would be & 13 they want to talk to you for hours, and they want you \\
\hline 14 due either Eliot Bernstein's children or Eliot Bernstein & 14 to read everything in the world. We don't do that. We \\
\hline 15 through those trusts, correct? & 15 don't have the time or the patience to do it. \\
\hline 16 A I don't know if they're due through that & 16 Q You would agree with me that the Bernstein \\
\hline 17 trust. It's my understanding the residence that Eliot & 17 Holdings, LLC certainly has nothing to do with the \\
\hline 18 lives in is owned in the LLC, which is responsible for & 18 malpractice action against Don Tescher, isn't that \\
\hline 19 paying the real estate taxes, the maintenance and & 19 correct? \\
\hline 20 everything like that. I think Eliot Bernstein asked & 20 A I wouldn't say absolutely, no. I'm not \\
\hline 21 the trustees of those trusts for money and they've run & 21 trying to be evasive. I don't think that's an element \\
\hline 22 out of money, so he asked Ted for more money. & 22 of the purported malpractice by Tescher and Spallina. \\
\hline 23 Q And the LLC is, in fact, the Bernstein & 23 Q Okay. Thanks. \\
\hline 24 Holdings, LLC? & 24 A Sure. \\
\hline 25 A Yes. & 25 THE COURT: All right. \\
\hline 158 & \\
\hline 1 Q Correct? & 1 MR. FEAMAN: Okay. \\
\hline 2 A Yes. & 2 MR. ROSE: Two questions? \\
\hline 3 Q Okay. And you received those documents back in & 3 THE COURT: Yes, that's it. \\
\hline 4 September, correct? & 4 RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION \\
\hline 5 A Michelle did, yes. & 5 BY MR. ROSE \\
\hline 6 Q Okay. And you are aware that there is a & 6 Q Bernstein Family Realty is not a beneficiary of \\
\hline 7 dispute over payments from the LLC from Mr. Ted Bernstein & 7 the estate, the will, the trust, is that correct? \\
\hline 8 to Mr. Eliot Bernstein, correct? You asked about it on & 8 A That's correct. \\
\hline 9 cross-examination? & \(9 \quad\) Q Absolutely nothing to do with what proceedings \\
\hline 10 A There is a dispute over payments to the LLC. & 10 are going to be before Judge Colin, as far as you know? \\
\hline 11 Q Payments from the LLC to either Mr. Eliot & 11 A Absolutely correct. \\
\hline 12 Bernstein or his kids or for the support of the house? & 12 MR. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor. \\
\hline 13 A You're confusing the LLC with the trust. & 13 THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. \\
\hline 14 Q Okay. So the trust should be making payments & 14 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. \\
\hline 15 to the Bernstein Holdings, LLC, is that your & 15 THE COURT: Any other witnesses on your end? \\
\hline 16 understanding? & 16 MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. \\
\hline 17 A No. Eliot wants money from Ted individually & 17 THE COURT: Okay. I have just a question. \\
\hline 18 and Ted as trustee of either Shirley or Simon's trust. & 18 In the estate case, where you're representing Ted, \\
\hline 19 And Shirley and Simon's trust don't permit & 19 that's the one where Mr. Feaman you're \\
\hline 20 distributions to Eliot. & 20 representing the creditor, correct? \\
\hline 21 Q You first found out about the issue -- that & 21 MR. FEAMAN: Yes. \\
\hline 22 dispute between Mr. Eliot Bernstein and Mr. Ted Bernstein & 22 THE COURT: Eliot is representing himself. \\
\hline 23 about the money when you spoke to him in September of & 23 Okay. I'll let you do this, Mr. Feaman. What's \\
\hline 24 2013, didn't you? & 24 pending in that case now, anything? Other than \\
\hline 25 A No, l learned about it from Alan Rose and Ted & 25 the motion to appoint a curator. \\
\hline
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\hline 1 & MR. FEAMAN: In the estate itself? & appointed as personal representative. & \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: Yeah. & THE COURT: Well, hear what I'm going to do, & \\
\hline 3 & MR. FEAMAN: I am only aware of the motion to & and then you'll see if you want to do that. & \\
\hline 4 & appoint Ted Bernstein as the -- & MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: PR. & THE COURT: Okay. Motion to disqualify is & \\
\hline 6 & MR. FEAMAN: -- personal representative. & denied. & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: Okay. & The burden is on Eliot. And I'm treating & \\
\hline 8 & MR. FEAMAN: But I have not reviewed the & this as really being Eliot's motion to show & \\
\hline 9 & file. & that he's an interested person under 731.20. & \\
\hline 10 & THE COURT: All right. And so is there an & He has not carried that burden. And so that & \\
\hline 11 & action filed with respect to Simon Bernstein's & would disqualify him from being someone who has & \\
\hline 12 & trust? & an interest in trying to stop Mr. Pankauski & \\
\hline 13 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No -- I'm sorry. & from representing Ted. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Not yet. & And, you know, I agree with the law that & \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: All right. Okay. Have a seat. & counsel -- Mr. Feaman just cited. This is & \\
\hline 16 & Can I see the motion that -- & really a view of Eliot from a subjective point & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Pankauski -- that you filed on behalf of & of view as to -- as a prospective client of & \\
\hline 18 & Ted to be appointed PR and the motion that asks & Mr. Pankauski, now that Mr. Pankauski is & \\
\hline 19 & for -- and I think it was both counsel, & venturing to represent Ted, which is a & \\
\hline 20 & including Mr. Glasko -- for a curator instead. & subsequent representation. Mr. Pankauski is & \\
\hline 21 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & barred from representing Ted if there are & \\
\hline 22 & THE COURT: Let me see those physically. & interests that -- in the estate -- that & \\
\hline 23 & MR. PANKAUSKI: This is my motion for & materially -- that are materially adverse to & \\
\hline 24 & appointment. And I can get you the response in & those of Eliot, and the rest of the rule. I & \\
\hline 25 & opposition. & find that Eliot has not carried his burden of & \\
\hline & & & 164 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: Okay. I remember seeing the & proof on that, even from a light most favorable & \\
\hline 2 & response, but -- okay. So here's -- everyone & to him, which l'm giving him. & \\
\hline 3 & finished, ready for me to rule? I'm ready to rule & So motion to disqualify denied. & \\
\hline 4 & on everything. & Ted's motion for appointment of himself as & \\
\hline 5 & MR. FEAMAN: The only thing I would add, Your & curator or administrator ad litem, denied. & \\
\hline 6 & Honor, would be the case that we faxed to you & William Stansbury and -- your client is & \\
\hline 7 & earlier today, and to everybody else, Metcalf v. & who? & \\
\hline 8 & Metcalf, 785 So. 2d. 747, which states, quote, in & MR. GLASKO: Excuse me, my client is Lisa and & \\
\hline 9 & considering whether the attorney-client privilege & Jill. & \\
\hline 10 & applies to disqualify an attorney from opposing a & THE COURT: Okay. Are they -- are they a & \\
\hline 11 & former client, the focus is on the perspective of & moving party in a formal sense? & \\
\hline 12 & the person seeking out the lawyer, not on what the & MR. GLASKO: They are the children of the & \\
\hline 13 & lawyer does after the consultation. & decedent, Judge. & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Okay. I agree that's the law. & THE COURT: But have they filed -- I don't & \\
\hline 15 & All right. So - yes. & have all the paperwork, I want to make sure I & \\
\hline 16 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, are you making a ruling & do -- have they filed requesting a -- that there & \\
\hline 17 & on the appointment of curator today? & be a curator other than Ted. & \\
\hline 18 & THE COURT: I am. I'm doing it in like about & MR. GLASKO: No, sir, l've only made an ore & \\
\hline 19 & a minute or two. & tenus motion. & \\
\hline 20 & MR. GLASKO: I would like to ask the court -- & THE COURT: The ore tenus motion is denied & \\
\hline 21 & because we wanted to lodge an ore tenus objection & only -- not on the merit because l'm not doing & \\
\hline 22 & to that. And I think the court needs -- & this -- but I don't have to because William is an & \\
\hline 23 & THE COURT: Why? & interested person, able to, as a secured creditor, & \\
\hline 24 & MR. GLASKO: -- the court needs to hear some & . who does have an interest under the case law and & \\
\hline 25 & information with regard to Ted's ability to be & under the statute in having this estate, which is & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

close the court -- but l'm going to stay here and let the lawyers and Eliot come back in to tell me what you've agreed to.
Okay. Thanks.
(Thereupon, the proceedings
were concluded at 5:03 p.m.)
what you've agreed to.
Okay. Thanks.
were concluded at 5:03 p.m.)

```
m going to stay here and
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}

CASE NO.: 502012CP004391XXXXSB

IN RE:

ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE

Petitionex (s),
vs.

TESCHER \& SPALIINA, P,A., (and all parties associated and of counsel); ROBERT L. SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

Respondent (s).

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN

DATE: June 12, 2014

TIME: 9:50 a.m. - 10:35 a.m.

1

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM E. STANSBURY:
PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A. 3615 W . BOYNTON BEACH BOUEEVARD BOYNTON BEACH, FL 33436 By: PETER M. FEAMAN, ESQ.

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN:

PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD ROSE KONOPKA \& DOW, P.A.
505 SOUTH FLAGLER DRTVE, SUITE 600 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401
By: ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ.

MATWICZYK \& BROWN
625 N. FLALGER DRIVE, SUITE 401
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401
By: BENJAMIN P. BROWN, ESQ. (CURATOR)

JOHN P, MORRISSEY, ESQ. 330 CLEMATIS STREET, SUITE 213
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401

ELIOT T. BERNSTEIN, Pro se

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before the Honorable MARTIN COLIN, at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, Room 8, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, state of Florida, on June 12, 2014, to wit:
\[
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
\]

MR. ROSE: Good morning, Your Honor, There is a number of matters in the simon Bernstein, but there is only one in the Shirley Bernstein, can we do that first?

THE COURT: Okay,
MR. ROSE: We have a motion to compel. May I approach?

THE COURT: Yeah. Sure.
MR, ROSE: This is just a very simple motion to compel. Prior to my involvement, predecessor counsel served a request to produce on Elliot Bernstein, December 19th. Mr. Bernstein has not responded and has indicated he doesn't believe that he -- he's indicated to me he doesn't believe he should have to provide us with any discovery.

THE COURT: AIl right, Let me take a look.
Where's Elliot?
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Hi,
THE COURT: So you got a request to produce in Shirley \({ }^{\text {r }} \mathrm{s}\) estate, correct?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: And haven't responded or done anything?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I think you are aware of the last counsel fled town under - w with the other counsel. And we've put in motions that Ted should not be the \(P R\), even though you ordered that, it was -- he's got too many conflicts now with the fraudulent documents, changing beneficiaries, all that.

THE COURT: But you still have to do a written response on discovery.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh, I didn't know because Manseri left. That was filed by Mansexi and to send things to Manseri would have been kind of crazy because he was resigning because all of that crazy.

THE COURT: Okay, All right. So what's the relief you're requesting on this motion?

MR. ROSE: Compel him to --
THE COURT: File a response?
MR. ROSE: Produce the documents.
THE COURT: You don't produce -- I don't ever do -- the key is not the production, that's part two. Part one is the response. You need a response so that you know what you're going to get in production.

MR. ROSE: If you're going to rule that he

1
hasn't waived his objection by not filing the response, \(I\) would be fine giving him ten days to file a written response.

THE COURT: How much time -- you have to file a written response to the request.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: How much time do you need?
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, 30 days.
THE COURT: Why not? It's going to be response -- and then when you file your response, it has to be a line item response. And then you have to produce that which you say is in your documents in your possession and control.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Unless \(I\) don't want to produce them to them.

THE COURT: No. No, there is no such thing you don't want to.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's the problem. I
feel that right now, for example, here in this court, we're allowing people to act in fiduciary capacities that they don't have. You're about to see that their legal strategy is to harass me. And that's the document that they're trying to keep privileged --

THE COURT: Hold on one second.

MR. FLLIOT BERNSTEIN: And they are asking for very sensitive information that's involved in RICO cases both in Nevada and the U.S. District Court in New York.

THE COURT: Tell you what \(I\) 'm going to do. Listen carefully, Here's how I'm handling this. I don't want you to give me speaking objections to discovery. okay. I'm going to change my order a little bit around. I'm moving the time frame up. You have 20 days from today to file a response. The response has to be line item. Pay attention to that. The rule requires that. Understand that part so far?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Address each thing in their thing?

THE COURT: Yeah, line item.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Got it.

THE COURT: Even though your time has passed, I'm going to allow you still to be able to make it a legal objection. But understand, this is not a speaking objection. These aren't stories, These aren't long -- objections are, for example, someone would write -- doesn't apply to you --attorney-client privilege. Work product. Okay. A legally recognized objection. Because otherwise
discovery takes place under Florida law.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Olsay.

THE COURT: Okay. Wxite the order up on that.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, I think, though --

THE COURT: So if you have a legally recognizable objection, you have to put that in writing. And then he knows what that is. I know what it is. We're not guessing. So I'm giving you a right to assert an objection, even though it's late, you just have to do it in writing,

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I get that. And appreciate that, My biggest concern is that I've put in motion after motion to get rid of the PR for all kinds of violations of fiduciaries, et cetera. I don't mind giving discovery to a guy like Ben Brown, who's honorable in doing things that \(I\) can't find anything wrong with. But when \(I\) find a litany of things that I've submitted to Your Honor that, you know, when we've got a hearing coming up to get rid of Ted in all these crazy capacities that he's assuming, and some of them are literally crazy, trustees have lost trusts, starting federal insurance cases, et
cetera. So, you know, I don't want to be giving this guy who's got a plan to attack my children's school records in this and all kinds of --

THE COURT: I don't know what discovery is, but Florida works it this way. You got discovery requests, If you have a legal objection, make it. MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: But doesn't it have to be that you're giving discovery to somebody who's qualified to be --

THE COURT: No, Right now, as long as they are a party - - this is -- Ted is currently right now successor PR of Shirley's estate?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.

MR. ELIIIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, he's given no notice to anybody, no accountings were turned over by the last PR.

THE COURT: Doesn't mean discovery can't -you know, I'll deal with that which is before me. okay.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I put my stuff before you a long time ago and --

THE COURT: There is nothing that \(I\) have that I don't hear, I mean, I hear stuff you bring to me.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I've got a ton of
motions that haven't been heard since May.

THE COURT: Have you done a notice of hearing?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I have. I'm trying to do one, but this guy won't schedule anything unless \(I\) depose and all kinds of crazy conditions. He's running around wasting everybody's time, money, et cetera.

THE COURT: Well, try to coordinate hearings.

MR. ELUIOT BERNSTEIN: I've been trying for days.

THE COURT: sit in the back and try to coordinate dates -- does he have matters pending that he's trying to get you to have heaxings for?

MR. ROSE: I think there is some hearings coming up in July. All \(I\) said, we'd like to get the discovery and his deposition before we have the motion on the hearing he has pending.

THE COURT: If the motion --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Conditions.
THE COURT: Okay. Just trying to figure out what happened to my trial, okay, so -- all right. You know, everyone has a duty to coordinate hearings. okay. So let's make sure we do that. I'll have -- you write up the order I
just mentioned on this one.
MR. ROSE: I have a --
THE COURT: Did you write it up?
MR. ROSE: I wrote up an order --
THE COURT: Write what I said about objections, write that out, spell that out. Legal objections only.

MR. ROSE: I'll type an order and submit it after sending it to Mr. Bernstein or do you want me to do it right now?

THE COURT: Do it right now. Do it before you leave today. Now I have time.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you Ted's counsel as the \(P R\) of the estate? Am I correct on that, Alan? Are you, Alan? See, here we go. Are you Ted's counsel? He's filed no notices of appearance.

THE COURT: He filed a pleading here. I have it.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: But not the original pleading. I'm sure the law says something about that.

THE COURT: Now everything is e-filed, so I don't know what's original and what's not.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, he's a

1
replacement counsel.
THE COURT: Okay. Good.

MR. ELITOT BERNSTETN: Without an original pleading -- he's filed no notice of appearance in any matter.

THE COURT: A pleading lilse this - he says Ted Bernstein, I'm his lawyer. That's what he said. okay.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: He hasn't addressed that. He didn't say he's Ted Bernstein's counsel as \(P R\) yet. I just asked him that.

THE COURT: Are you Ted Bernstein's lawyer?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.

MR. ELIIOT BERNSTEIN: As PR to the Shirley estate?

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Wait. Wait. Don't
answer that for him.

THE COURT: Estate of Shirley Bernstein, correct?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.

MR. ELIIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. What's next?
Now, we're going to the other estate.
MR. BROWN: Simon. I have a second petition
for payment of curator's fees, and this would be for April.

I don't know if there is any objection.
THE COURT; Any objection?
MR. BROWN: The order is substantially similar to the first one, just changes the numbers.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: May I be heard on his petition?
THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ROSE: We have no objection to his fees, but I do think it's important to point out to the court -- and it's going to be related to the next motion that we have. Ms. Eliot Bernstein sent the e-mails to Ben Brown and when we end up with, you know, a petition for instructions, we had two of them on May \(23 r d\), and you instructed everyone that he should not be Elliot's lawyer, And Eliot responded he doesn't have to just, you know, jump through hoops: Ben is concerned that he, you know, fulfill his duties and not run afoul of Eliot, but we've got two or three more petitions. And the fees, I think, so far, approaching \(\$ 50,000\) for the curator.

THE COURT: Well, the way it works is pretty
simple, I mean, you know, if Mr. Brown is getting bombarded by a party, and, you know, I mean, he's concerned that it may not be necessary and reasonable, then he, you know, he deals with that and causes himself not to have wasted time, but he knows how to handle that.

MR. ROSE: We have no objection to Mr. Brown. It's not his -- the issue is not really with him, but I think the curator needs some protection from constantly being bombarded --

THE COURT: He can protect himself.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you his attorney too?

THE COURT: Eliot, no, no. Don't do that.
MR. BROWN: Actually, Judge, this kind of dovetails into what happened on February 23rd. I did have the two motions for instruction, one of them was when Eliot asked me --

MR. FEAMAN: May 23rd.
MR. BROWN: May 23rd. Asked me to look into 44 different subcategories of documents and kind of take the lead on objecting to the Tescher Spallina accounting, The other one is with regard to the will, the 2012 will. And I have the pages of the transcript of what Your Honor said. And,
essentially, I said it's not the curator's role to take the lead on objecting to the accounting. It's not the curator's role to -.

THE COURT: Hold on one second.
MR. BROWN: It's not the curatox's role to challenge or even investigate the circumstances of the 2012 will. Your Honor --

THE COURT: You know, but here's the thing, if \(I\) said that and you then are being asked to do something that you don't think is within the scope of the curatorship, then you make a decision based upon that.

MR. BROWN: Well, Your Honor, sometimes it's not necessarily all that clear.

THE COURT: That's why you use discretion and you decide what to get involved with and whatnot, and, then depending on that, I may hear from someone else who likes that idea or not.

MR. BROWN: What Your Honor said -- actually what Your Honor said on the 23 rd was that you said, stop, you don't have to go further. That's the position. That's law. You don't do that. If there is an accounting, there is a rule on objections. The parties object, they don't use you. You don't work for them, which is true, I'm
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & no one's here attorney, \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: Right. \\
\hline 3 & MR. BROWN: You work for the court, that's \\
\hline 4 & what you said. You said, you are not an advocate. \\
\hline 5 & You only investigate things that the parties may \\
\hline 6 & be interested in. They can do that -- do what \\
\hline 7 & they think they need to do based on the rules of \\
\hline 8 & procedure and the statutes. \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: All right. So if someone asked \\
\hline 10 & to do something you think is outside the scope of \\
\hline 11 & what I ordered, what I mentioned in the hearings, \\
\hline 12 & then don't do it. \\
\hline 13 & MR. BROWN: Your Honor, you also didn't enter \\
\hline 14 & an order on those motions on May \(23 r d\). \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: Well, someone has to submit them \\
\hline 16 & to me. \\
\hline 17 & MR. BROWN: I did, Your Honor. I \\
\hline 18 & submitted -- ( submitted them to all the parties. \\
\hline 19 & Mr. Rose had some changes. \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Okay. \\
\hline 21 & MR. BROWN: I then -- you then went on \\
\hline 22 & vacation and then, unfortunately, got ill. I sent \\
\hline 23 & you a letter that said here are the competing \\
\hline 24 & orders, and here's what you said. \\
\hline 25 & THE COURT: I didn't see the competing \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
orders.
MR. BROWN: That's the order. Now, Mr. Eliot Bernstein, he had an objection because he said that all of the minor beneficiaries didn't necessarily receive notice of the May \(23 r d\) hearing. But, in fact, based on the e-mail report, \(I\) believe that everyone has received -- I mean, here's how long the e-mail service list is. Everybody received notice of everything.

THE COURT: What's the - what's the dispute now with the form of these orders?

MR. BROWN: Well, the dispute was -- Mr. Rose had some changes to what \(I\) submitted.

THE COURT: So you folks did -- did you agree upon the final form?

MR. BROWN: He's got handwritten - we didn't agree on a final form because \(I\) think, and I don't want to put words in Elliot's mouth, Eliot said I don't agree to either orders because there are minor beneficiaries of the trust, the pour-over trust, who weren't here on the \(23 x d\), or didn't get notice. And this is the notice - service list. I mean, this is everybody.

THE COURT: Let's put the notice aside. Is there any other . - have you guys agreed upon the
form of the order now, or you didn't notice this?
MR. ROSE: I think that my comments are minor. I think Mr. Brown approved them. So I have no objection to the order.

THE COURT: In this packet, give me a clean order, Mr . Brown.

MR. BROWN: All right. I didn't have a problem with -- it's not necessarily a clean order, Your Honor, itself an order.

THE COURT: One that \(I\) can sign, I mean. This has Mr. Rose's changes that he has written in.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I - do we all
have copies of Roses' things?
THE COURT: Let me see what --
MR. BROWN: Mr. Rose e-mailed them to everybody. But they are attached to that May 30th letter.

THE COURT: Iיll give you a copy of it. Any reason not to sign this based upon that hearing that I had.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Are you saying he's not authorized, as the estate, if he finds missing items, or whatever, to challenge the accounting as the --
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2
```

THE COURT: He's not - he's not filing objections to the accounting, the parties are. You're not, correct?
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: But he's the estate, isn't he? Isn't he a party known as the estate?
THE COURT: Yeah, but he's a curator, that's different.
MR. BROWN: I'm essentially a caretaker until --
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, wouldn't the PR --
THE COURT: Let me ask you this --
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: If you got -- if
you're the $P R$ and you got an accounting that's fraudulent in front of you, don't you have a duty to challenge that and $m$
THE COURT: Maybe so, but that's up to everybody .-
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: But you're saying he's not authorized.
THE COURT: He's not.
MR. ELTIOT BERNSTEIN: You're precluding him.
THE COURT: He is not.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, he's the $P R$ tech --

```

MR. BROWN: NO, I'm not the personal representative, and \(I\) have declined to serve.

THE COURT: He's the curator, it's a different role.

MR. BROWN: In fact, Your Honor, I was supposed to be the curator for just a couple of months.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. BROWN: We don't even have a hearing set,
THE COURT: Yeah, the parties have to do the objections to the accounting.

MR. FLLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay,
MR. BROWN: Your Honor, it's not anything that's teed up today, is that we don't have a hearing set --

THE COURT: What do you mean, a hearing on --
MR. BROWN: -- to get a personal
representative.
THE COURT: You know, I can't deal with getting hearing dates. Is there a problem with getting hearing dates?

MR, BROWN: There's not a problem with getting hearing dates. It's a problem with getting anybody to move to appoint -- thank you -to appoint a personal representative. And --

THE COURT: Well, I thought the hearing was on the objections on the accounting.

MR. BROWN: This is the other one, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Oh.
MR. BROWN: There is a motion objecting to the accountings, but there is no hearing set to appoint a personal representative. And I'm - y you know, frankly, I'm the curator. I'm --

THE COURT: Well, at some point if no one wants to be PR, you know, I'll discharge you and the estate will be closed. Just close the estate.

MR. BROWN: I think that's the case right now, nobody wants to be a PR.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, that's not true.
THE COURT: Well, someone has to file a petition, though.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm - I got a ton of petitions in that I'm trying to get hearings. Like I said, they are blocking and trying to get this case closed.

I mean, he just said are you having problems scheduling hearings. I want hearings since, you know, May.

THE COURT: Hold on. Let me take a look at
this one.
Okay. All right. So I'm going to order everyone cooperate in coordinating hearings. That's a silly thing to have difficulty with.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Am I forced to take a deposition before I schedule a hearing with you on an unrelated --

THE COURT: You can schedule a hearing, Then you get a hearing date from me.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: He won't schedule a hearing until I take a deposition.

THE COURT: Okay. Here's the way it works. scheduling is one thing.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Right.
THE COURT: Discovery is another thing.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: That's right.
THE COURT: You try to do your discovery based upon hearing dates coming up. So if you get a hearing date within 30 days, then that tells you you have to have discovery sooner. If you have a hearing in six months, unlikely in my division, then, you know, you could spread out your discovery requests, but they're separate and apart.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: No, but I'm trying to
schedule a hearing and he's refusing unless I take --

THE COURT: You get a hearing. And then depending upon what the nature is that's going to be heard, if discovery is necessary, you do discovery, They're two independent items. MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: But your secretary or your clerk has told us that we have to coordinate our hearings with these guys, doesn't seem they have to do that with us, since none of this is scheduled with our knowledge. But nonetheless, if

I want to schedule a hearing, I got to get approval from nine guys, three of them won't respond at all. Alan Rose says you better take a deposition or \(I^{\prime \prime m}\) not scheduling hearings. And, you know, they are trying to delay it so they can get in all these hearings while a bunch of criminals sit around --

THE COURT: All right. Irll have my assistant come out and see you folks when you're done here, before you all leave, and she'll coordinate hearings with you.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I can't do that, I got to --

THE COURT: Why?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: -- go back and check my schedules. Can I call in?

THE COURT: You want quick service and I'm going to give you --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I appreciate that. I greatly appreciate that.

THE COURT: So there's a rule there that says if you ask for something and I give it to you, like that --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't bring a cell phone, I don't have my schedule, I got doctors -that's the biggest concern \(-{ }^{-}\)and if I'm free on those days they want to schedule them, great. I already gave them a date, you know, July 14 th.

THE COURT: Try to work it out, werll get there.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Your secretary has been holding it.

MR. BROWN: Judge, the problem with appointing a personal representative is not that nobody is - - there is no hearing date - because nobody has actually filed a motion to appoint a personal representative.

THE COURT: But Eliot says he has.
MR. ROSE: There's two motions pending,

There's a petition by Ted to be the personal representative. I think Eliot may have filed a petition to be the personal representative. We need to set those for a contested hearing.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Brown, there are two.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: He denied Ted's motion.

MR. ROSE: I'll set them.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Ted already filed a motion to be PR and you denied it.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. ROSE: We had a motion pending, Your Honor, and you appointed a curator.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ROSE: In the meantime, to avoid what's going to be a very expensive and costly battle, I've been having discussions with Mr. Brown as curator, a number of discussions of a way to try to streamline -- Mr. Brown can confirm that's the goal.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. ROSE: Just had those discussions. I've tried to have discussions with some of the other beneficiaries to see if we can at least get a consensus. I thought that was a worthwhile
exercise before we have what's going to be a half day or day contested trial on who should be the PR. One of the motions dovetails into that -. I have two motions pending today. One is a motion to compel Eliot to appear for deposition and comply with the privilege rule. We had a hearing you may recall on May 23 rd with inadvertent privilege. I have that motion. I also have a motion that relates to Mr . Brown, if you want to do that motion first, in case Mr. Brown wanted to leave. We filed a petition - a motion for --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I'd like to do the privilege because if we get through this, we'll find out that he might not even be here in a minute.

MR. BROWN: I'd actually prefer to do --
MR. ROSE: Do whatever Mr. Brown likes.
MR. BROWN: I don't know that I like it, but
I don't have any opposition to it.
MR. ROSE: It's the one about the mortgage.
MR. BROWN: Okay.
THE COURT: Let me see.
MR. ROSE: This is a motion -- this is kind of in line with Your Honor's instructions. Ted Bernstein, as successor trustee of the simon

Bernstein trust, has asked the curator to take action with regard to an asset of the estate, Mr. Brown has indicated, consistent with your ruling, that's not his job. So we have filed a motion seeking instructions. And we are before you addressing one -- there is only a real handful of assets in the estate. One of the assets in the estate of simon Bernstein is a second mortgage that the estate holds on a piece of property. The property is owned by an entity called Bernstein Family Realty, LiLC. That's an entity that was created by Simon while he was alive. And while he was alive, Simon was the manager of that entity. This Bernstein Family Realty, which owns this house, there is also a first mortgage on the house held by the seller back when the house was sold in 2008. So there is a first mortgage of \(\$ 110,000\). THE COURT: Purchase money mortgage? MR. ROSE: Purchase money mortgage. That mortgage matured, technically, a few years ago and they did an amendment, and they extended the term for three years. The lease matures on June 19th, which is in about seven days. Next week. The first mortgage, not the lease, the first mortgage matures. They are owed \(\$ 110,000\), plus interest.

The mortgage is held by a gentleman named walter Somm. There is unpaid taxes for 2013. We're told that the house is not insured. Okay. That's the starting point. What the estate has, which Mr. Brown is in possession of, is the estate has a second mortgage on that property. There's a second mortgage holder on property when there is a first, unpaid taxes, no insurance, you would want to take action to try to protect whatever equity is in the property. The current occupant of the house -- and just so I can assure you -- we're going to hear it in a minute -- this is no way to try to harm Eliot. This is trying to protect the assets that are in the estate, and try to protect the value of it. But the tenant of the property is Eliot Bernstein and his family. They live in there rent free. They don't pay taxes. I don't have all the information other than that. And just if you indulge me for a little background. I think simon bought the house for Eliot. He put the ownership, though, in an entity called Bernstein Family Realty. It's encumbered by two mortgages. And the mortgages exceed the value of the property. I don't know what it's exactly worth. I attached a zillow,
which is not an appraisal.
THE COURT: What's the issue, though?
MR. ROSE: The issue is, someone's got to administer the second mortgage. It's in default and no one has been administering it. And --

THE COURT: You say administering it, seek collection of its payment.

MR. ROSE: Potentially. Or do something to protect the asset. And in addition, we've asked permission to have the estate potentially pay the first -- buy the first mortgage. Because if we don't take care of the first mortgage on June 19, what's going to happen is that Mr . Somm is going to hire legal counsel.

THE COURT: When you say simon held a note and mortgage, second mortgage?

MR. ROSE: Right.
THE COURT: Who was - who's the moxtgagor?
MR. ROSE: Bernstein Family Realty.
THE COURT: I thought they owned the property.

MR. ROSE: They own the property. They are the title owner. They are the mortgage -- they are the mortgagee of the property.

THE COURT: Okay. But who's the mortgagor?

MR. ROSE: Of the second mortgage, simon Bernstein, while he was alive. So now it's the estate of Simon Bernstein.

THE COURT: So he owed the money. He's the debtor on the debtor/creditor part of the mortgage, simon was the debtor?

MR. ROSE: No, Simon was the creditor,
THE COURT: Who's the debtor?
MR. ROSE: Bernstein Family Realty, an entity that owns the house,

THE COURT: Okay, I'm not -- I thought - they own the house and Bernstein Family Realty borrowed \(\$ 360,000\), or whatever, the amount of the second mortgage is?

MR. ROSE: Correct, Bernstein Family Realty potentially owns \(\$ 110,000\), plus interest, to Walter somm. He's the first mortgage holder. And Bernstein Family Realty also owes 365,000 , plus interest, to the estate of simon Bernstein.

THE COURT: Which -- that transaction, how did that second mortgage come about?

MR. ROSE: Simon put -- I think simon put up all the money for the house and the renovations. And so in order to \(m\) -

THE COURT: So he had the owner give him a
second mortgage back.
MR. ROSE: Correct. He was the manager of the ownership entity. Simon structured this through Bernstein Family Realty. Bernstein Family Realty, after Simon passed away, the new manager of Bernstein Family Realty is Oppenheimer, And I believe the equity -- the owners of the equity of Bernstein Family Realty are three trusts created for Elliot's three children. No one is disputing that. But the house is clearly upside down, unless itrs worth more than \(\$ 500,000\), which it doesn't appear to be worth more than \(\$ 500,000\). If it is, that's great because that's better for the estate. The concern here for \(T\) ed as the fiduciary for the trust is that we have an asset. It's the mortgage. It's not fully secured. It's probably mostly secured, if you know what I mean, partially secured. There is equity in the property over and above the first mortgage and the taxes, but there's not enough to pay it off in full. And so the concern is that Walter Somm, a third party, innocent guy, will have to file a lawsuit to foreclose his mortgage. Eliot is potentially going to be a party to that lawsuit because he's a tenant. Mr, Somm will probably spend a hundred or
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & \$200,000 in legal fees fighting with Eliot \\
\hline 2 & Bernstein. And then at the end of the day, poof, \\
\hline 3 & there is nothing left. And the estate's \$365,000 \\
\hline 4 & mortgage is worth nothing. \\
\hline 5 & We've raised the issue with Mr. Brown. We \\
\hline 6 & have worked very closely with him. \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: I understand. \\
\hline 8 & What do you say Eliot? \\
\hline 9 & MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, to deconstruct \\
\hline 10 & all those lies -- you really want me to start -- \\
\hline 11 & my father bought a house for my children. It \\
\hline 12 & wasn't an asset of the estate till suddenly the \\
\hline 13 & guys who altered the estate documents put it on an \\
\hline 14 & amended inventory, right after the long arm of the \\
\hline 15 & law knocked on their door and said come to the \\
\hline 16 & sheriff's office. This is part of an extortion. \\
\hline 17 & I put it in motion to you. I asked for emergency \\
\hline 18 & hearings. And what they have done is beyond \\
\hline 19 & criminal. First of all, my -- the company, BFR, \\
\hline 20 & is owned by my three kids entirely. The house \\
\hline 21 & trust owned the house. okay. My brother and \\
\hline 22 & Oppenheimer conspired -- and I got a whole bunch \\
\hline 23 & of stuff showing what's happened here -- to take \\
\hline 24 & over the management position of BFR. When my \\
\hline 25 & father died there was supposed to be vote by the \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
members, my three minor children, which could be, or my wife, as guardians, to elect a new member. Instead, Spallina anointed Janet Craig of Oppenheimer to self-anoint herself as manager of BFR, Then after they misuse all these funds, telling us, oh, we're going to use the kids' education funds to pay your house expenses, when there is all these other entities that have been paying for the house for years, my brother -Janet Craig of Oppenheimer says, oh, I'm turning over the management to Ted. She hands him all my personal files, my kids, all our statements, bills, everything, which I don't even get the bills. They've been going through BFR --

THE COURT: Okay. I got your position. Let me ask you this. What's the relief that you're asking for, though?

Hold on.
I don't know what the relief is, that's what I'm trying to figure out.

MR. ROSE: The relief is for first - at the request of the curator, the curator would like to transfer the asset to the trustee of Simon's revocable trust.

THE COURT: The property that is owned by

Bernstein Family Realty, LLC?
MR. ROSE: No, technically, the asset is just the mortgage.

THE COURT: Is the mortgage.
MR. ROSE: Yeah, you know, the tangible --
THE COURT: That's owned by the estate right now.

MR. ROSE: It's owned by the estate and under the control of Mr . Brown.

THE COURT: And you --
MR. ROSE: They would remain liable for -the trustees of the revocable trust is liable for the debts of a creditor. so, you know, Mr, Stansbury's counsel is here and he would be someone that might object to it. We're not asking to transfer it, other than to have someone other than Mr. Brown, who's not prepared to administer the asset, to administer the asset. In fact, in discussions I've had with Mr. Brown, I mean, his -- one of Mr, Brown's discussions with me was he could transfer all the assets in the estate to the revocable trust. If the trustee of the revocable trust could administer the assets, he would still be liable to Mr . Stansbury for any claims, And, you know, you could have Mr. Brown
as a curator take a very nominal role so we don't have to incur as much money. Alternatively, we could have the \(P R\) hearing which --

THE COURT: That's what we need to do. We need to have the PR hearing.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: We need to have an evidentiary hearing on this, don't we, Your Honor?

MR. ROSE: But in the short -.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR, ROSE: In the short term, if you look at the exhibit we attached.

THE COURT: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. ROSE: The second mortgage. It's the Exhibit A. I don't have tabs, I apologize, but if you flip through --

THE COURT: I see it.
MR. ROSE: So there is a promissory note. It's signed by Simon Bernstein. I mean, I. don"t think there is any question that that's simon's signature. And he did it in July of 2008. And if you go to the next page, which is the actual second mortgage, it's recorded in the public records of this county, on september the 4 th, 2008 .

MR. ELUIOT BERNSTEIN: Missing the promissory
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note, which was supposed to be attached, but it's not.

MR. ROSE: I didn't think - I would request that Mr . Bernstein not comment when \(\mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{I} m}\) speaking. THE COURT: Yeah, true.

MR. ROSE: So we have a mortgage, the second mortgage, It's signed by simon Bernstein. He set up the structure with Bernstein Family Realty. I don't care about the structure, We don't control Bernstein Family Realty, We have nothing to do with it. Our concern is very simply: If you ask Eliot Bernstein what are you going to do when Walter somm files a foreclosure action, he's going to tell you, I'm going to make Walter Somm spend every penny he's got to try to foreclose the mortgage on Bernstein Family Realty. And we're going to be back here in two years, or whatever, saying the mortgage is worthless because it's all been burned away in fees. But at the same time, \(I\) don't think it's appropriate for Mr. Brown or the estate to buy the mortgage if -- until we take the deposition of Mr . Bernstein and find out if he has any issues with regard to the mortgage or the structure. I mean, other, you know, everything, you know, is a conspiracy,
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THE COURT: I got it. All right.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I got more.
MR. FEAMAN: May it please the court,
THE COURT: Yeah.
MR, FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of Mr. Stansbury, about the largest and only creditor of the estate, sizeable amount, in a litigation that's pending before Judge Blanc. Mr. Stansbury's interest obviously is to preserve or protect the assets of the estate in the event that he's successful in his litigation. We've been in touch with Mr. somm. Mr. Stansbury actually knows Mr. Somm, the first mortgage holder. And it's a possibility that we can get him to forebear for a little while until we get this straightened out.

THE COURT: Why don't you try to do that. Because I'd really like to get passed the PR stage because that would clear the way to have things done in the ordinary course here.

MR. FEAMAN: Right, So we think we can do that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FEAMAN: And he told me he won't do anything precipitous. He knows -- he knew

Mr. Bernstein, he knows Mr. Stansbury, and --
THE COURT: All \(x\) ight.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, one
last --
THE COURT: Okay. Hold on. No. No, I'm deferring on the motion for instruction in this matter.

MR. BROWN: Judge, on the \(P R\) thing just -I'm going to go ahead and seek dates in early August.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. BROWN: Because we have notices of unavailability for July.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: And frankly, between now and early August, I can minimize my fees by just hanging on to what the estate's got.

THE COURT: If you guys will coordinate those hearings.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I've never not coordinated a hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. What's next, the last one.

MR. ROSE: Last one. Two motions to compel.
MR. BROWN: Actually, may I be excused?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR, ROSE: On the motion we just heard, Your Honor, I'll send in an order that says the motion is deferred. Mr, Stansbury will work with Mx, Somm and report to the parties.

THE COURT: Exactly,
* * * *

MR. ROSE: We've got two motions to compel, one is very simple, One is more complicated. They are in the same document. The first one is just a deposition. I've asked Mr. Bernstein if I could take his deposition, get some dates. He indicated that he would not appear for deposition for whatever reason. And I just think we need an order compelling him to appear for deposition within 20 days or something to that effect.

THE COURT: Okay. And the matters you want to depose him on are what?

MR, ROSE: There are a numbex of pending
petitions. So - they're set for evidentiary hearing, Some of them involve things he wants the trustee or the personal representative to do for him and --

THE COURT: Hold on, Elliot, do you have pending petitions?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I do.
THE COURT: Okay. And you want hearing dates on those, correct?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: All of them.
THE COURT: Okay. So two things are going to happen. You're going to get hearing dates and you're going to sit for deposition.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I never said I wouldn't sit for a deposition.

THE COURT: He just said you wouldn't.
MR, ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: He says things for me that are just completely untrue, like the last whole litany of things he said I said about Walt Somm. By the way, I got a letter from Walt somm that addresses -- that he's mortified what they're doing.

THE COURT: Okay. So the answer is -- I want to you sit for deposition. They are entitled to depose you on the outstanding --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Maybe.
THE COURT: And I want hearing dates.
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: I want the deposition to take
place before the hearing dates.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I need to have the hearings if they're qualified to be \(P R\), as my brother's saying he's successor trustee here before you today. He's never sent out notice. The guys you threw out of here that were acting that way, haven't noticed anybody that they transferred it to Ted, that he's accepted, accountings haven't been sent out, no procedural -- in fact, you appointed my brother on my mom's estate, God knows how long ago, no accountings, We have three years, no accountings in my mother's estate or trust. There is robbery and fraud going on right before your nose every day because these two clowns continue to represent - -

THE COURT: Cool it. Cool it. We don't -MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, Whatever. THE COURT: No. No. Stop.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. These two people are not following any rules or procedures and we keep having hearings that are hurting my family with people who are working to hurt me and haven't followed a single rule of things. He hasn't notified anybody.
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THE COURT: You're going to schedule your hearings. You'll call up and my assistant will give you three or four hearing dates. You'll call, you'll coordinate, and, you know what, if you're getting -- if you say -- if you say that they are not cooperating, pick a date.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Pick a date. If you say that -and that's the rule that applies.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, Perfect.
THE COURT: If one side says the other side is not cooperating, pick a date, and then I'll determine whether there is in-propriety.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. And I don't want to be deposed before I have those hearings to see if they are qualified to depose me. Because --

THE COURT: No, I'm letting them take your deposition on your pending petitions. Okay. on your petitions that you're going to get hearing dates on, they can take discovery.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh, just on that.
THE COURT: On those matters, yeah. That's what he's asking for to be able to take your deposition.

MR, ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: That's fine. okay.
MR. ROSE: There is a hearing currently set for July 12th. It's an hour hearing on some objections to accountings.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: On behalf of the trustee, we got an extension to file objections to accountings. Mr. Block, who represents Tescher \& Spallina, is here, he wasn't in the loop for that. So we have an hour of your time reserved for - - I would suggest it might be appropriate to have a status conference. We can have the status conference before the August evidentiary hearing on all the pending matters, where everyone can come in and actually go over the pending matters, see what issues could be resolved and what issues are open, because we have an hour of your time, which is valuable.

THE COURT: Okay, Fine.
MR. ROSE: That's good. Then the last motion we have is the second half of this, werve addressed this issue once. This is the e-mail that my client inadvertently sent to Elliot Bernstein.

THE COURT: I thought I dealt with this
already
MR. ROSE: You did deal with it. You dealt with it in sort of an informal way, if you recall, It happened on Thursday night, we were here Friday morning, I raised it because \(I\) was concerned that I wanted it to be dealt with immediately.

THE COURT: T'his is the inadvertent
disclosure?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir. And Mr, Bernstein said he would comply with what Your Honor said. We have a transcript of the hearing.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: You told me to go home and read the rule - -

THE COURT: There is a rule that says --
MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I read it. It's not privileged. It's a letter from my brother to me, there is no attorney involved. I don't know what they're talking about. This is more of this harassment. And when you read this letter, the reason why they want to hide this letter between my brother and me --

THE COURT: But it's you -- put the letter aside for a moment. If there is a claim of inadvertent disclosure - - which is what they made, right?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: Then under the rule, you do what you're supposed to do.

MR, ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, Let's say that my brother inadvertently sent me an e-mail saying, hey, let's murder my brother, which is basically what this says. And then all of a sudden they want to retract it and pull it back, hide it from the world, They've gotten a levied threat across. Now, I sent this letter, as I told you, the minute I read it to everybody who's named in it. And I've already had two people call saying they are afraid of my brother being crazy and starting to harass them based on this letter,

THE COURT: We're getting far afield.
MR, ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Did you respond pursuant to the rule?

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, I told him I don't believe so, let's set a hearing.

MR. ROSE: At the hearing on the date Elliot said he'll do all that, he'll do what you told him to do. And then he e-mailed me --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, and he --
MR. ROSE: Can I, six, please speak?

MR. ELITOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah. Yeah.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSE: So I got an e-mail from Elliot after the hearing that says \(I\) just got back and will definitely delete and destroy the e-mail in accordance with the law. That's the first e-mail from Eliot. That was at 1:05 on the day of the hearing. And then \(I\) got -- at 3:30 an e-mail from his colleague, Crystal Cox, who's the woman that blogs things, basically using expletives against me. And then Ms. Cox has taken the letter that was privileged and has republished it, e-mailing it to lawyers in the case, and putting it on the Internet, And then \(I\) got an e-mail from Elliot telling me he will not comply with the issue and he wants to challenge the assertion of the privilege. So I realize this was an 8:45 and \(I\), you know, would - might need to be set for an evidentiary hearing -- but we're here and we could do an evidentiary hearing to decide this privilege issue.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, I'd like to do that.

THE COURT: Hold on. After Elliot got the notice of inadvertent disclosure, did he file a
response, Mr. Rose?
MR. ROSE: He has not filed a response in the court.

THE COURT: To you, though?
MR. ROSE: He did respond to me.
THE COURT: Let me read this. Did he say that -- did he do what the rule says, party receiving a notice of inadvertent disclosure either destroys the matters and says that, you know, they"ve taken care of it and nothing is being disclosed, disseminated, or they can actually --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: It's not an inadvertent disclosure --

THE COURT: But they've made that claim it is, though.

MR. ELJIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: The rule says, if you want to challenge that, you have to do that in writing.

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I did. I told him, I'm challenging it, let's have a hearing.

THE COURT: Okay, All right. So then he said a challenge, he said it wasn't privileged. That's one of the grounds.

MR. ROSE: In an e-mail he's taken the
position that it's not privileged, it was intended for him.

THE COURT: That's one of the rule-related items you can mention.

MR. ROSE: During -- in the intervening time he's not allowed to be sending it out to --

MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't sent it to a single person that didn't already get it before \(I\) came to this court. I contacted all those people out of respect to Your Honor. And what my word was, and I said, hey, guys, here's a rule, you're supposed to destroy this possibly, contact your lawyer. Whatever. Crystal Cox said to him, screw you. I don't control her. She's a blogger. Nobody seems to be able to control her, but that's her. And he's --

THE COURT: Okay. All right.
MR. ROSE: This is one of the --
THE COURT: You can set that for hearing.
MR. ROSE: There's one other part of our motion, we asked for an injunction. He did say he can't control Crystal Cox. He sends her everything in this case. He sends her every pleading, every order. He sent her my privileged e-mail. Her e-mail to me says, I cordially invite
you to go blank yourself, And then she goes out on me. And then she sends the e-mail, the same e-mail, this privileged e-mail, she sends to every counsel and party in the case twice already. He should be enjoined from communicating with her. THE COURT: So he's already made a statement on the record, that is Elliot, that since the time that he got the notice of inadvertent disclosure, he has made no new disclosure to anyone, true? MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: True. THE COURT: okay, MR. ROSE: So -MR. ELLIOT BERNSTEIN: I did everything else just to be safe.

THE COURT: Set it for hearing.
MR, ROSE: An evidentiary hearing?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE; Okay.

THE COURT; On whether it's privileged because that's what the rule says. Go ahead, folks, Thanks. MR. ROSE: Do you want the order from the first or you want me to just mail them in? THE COURT: You can mail it in. I got a 9:30 still to do.
(Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 10:35 a.m.)
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IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN AND FOR

PAM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA

File No. 502012 CP004391XXXXSB Probate Division

IN RE: ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN

CURATOR'S MOTION FOR INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING AUTHORITY TO LIQUIDATE IRA

CURATOR'S MOTION TO INSPECT AND TAKE POSSESSION OF ESTATE TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY

DATE TAKEN: Thursday, June 19, 2014

TIME:

PLACE: PALM BEACH SOUTH COUNTY COURTHOUSE 200 West Atlantic Avenue Delray Beach, Florida 33444

BEFORE:
HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN, CIRCUIT JUDGE

HEARING TAKEN BEFORE:

LISA GREENWELL, Court Reporter

APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF THE CURATOR

BENJAMIN P. BROWN, Esquire
THE LAW OFFICES OF MATWICZYK \& BROWN, LLP. 625 North Flagler Drive Suite 401
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

\section*{APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE}

ALAN B. ROSE, Esquire
THE LAW OFFICES OF PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD \& ROSE, P.A.
505 South Flagler Drive
Suite 600
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401

\section*{APPEARANCE ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM STANSBURY}

JEFFREY T. ROYER, Esquire
THE LAW OFFICES OF PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
THE LAW OFFICES OF PETER M. FEAMAN, P,
3695 West Boynton Beach Boulevard Suite 9
Boynton Beach, Florida 33436
(Thereupon, the following proceedings were had:)

MR. ROSE: Morning, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hi. What do you have?
MR. ROSE: We have three orders from last weeks hearings that \(I\) submitted to all counsel. Mr. Eliot Bernstein has an objection to all three orders.

If I may, these were Motions to Compel, fairly simple -- may \(I\) approach with the orders.

MR. ROYER: Mr. Bernstein has some objection, I believe.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: Just three different orders.
THE COURT: So I ruled on these matters, right?

MR. ROSE: You ruled on the matters and no other counsel has objected to the form of the orders.

Mr. Eliot Bernstein has some objections that he's e-mailed to me in a lengthy e-mail.

THE COURT: So here's the way this works everyone; \(I\) enter an order, someone becomes a scrivener and writes out what an I ruled. It's not a chance to change it, not a chance to argue
with it, it's just putting into writing what my rulings is.

If \(I\) find that anyone tries to argue to rework the order, the merits of the order, the subject, today, this morning, there will be sanctions granted, okay.

So you say on behalf of your side that these orders represent what I ruled?

MR. ROSE: I submit - yes.
THE COURT: And everyone else agrees it's what \(I\) ruled except for Mr. Eliot Bernstein?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: And you say I ruled this?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I said that I was -we were tricked by Mr . Rose on some of that stuff that needs to be reheard. I put in an objection to --

THE COURT: That's not what I'm asking. That's not the purpose of this exercise.

I gave --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The order --
THE COURT: I announced what the purpose of this was. If you proceed and try to do anything other than tell me that this is not what I ruled --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: \(I\) have an order on it. I don't mind --

THE COURT: You're not doing me a favor by telling me that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Listen, I'm putting in the objection the minute you sign that, that it was -- so use it for my objection right here.

THE COURT: Well, \(I\) have to have -- if you want to have something reheard --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's the problem --
THE COURT: -- you have to enter an order. Listen to me.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. You have to have an order entered to have an rehearing on it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. I get that.
But here's my problem, he is submitting orders and he's got adverse interest in this case that legally preclude him from acting in these capacities --

THE COURT: No, that's not true because if \(I\) ask him to be a scrivener and write an order on that \(I\) order, that's not task that's here.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But he's legally barred from representing when he has adverse
interest.
THE COURT: That's your position on that.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, that's the Bar rules, that's the law.

THE COURT: But I told him to write an order -- I told him write an order on what I've done.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I know, but he's acting out of his capacities --

THE COURT: Okay. That's your version of it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, that's --
THE COURT: I don't deal with bar things here, I'm dealing --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's law. He's not qualified.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, you're not listening, okay. If I ask a lawyer to put into writing that which \(I\) order and they do that, then they're doing the right thing because that's what I've asked them to do.

We don't the have here in state Court clerks to write out my order, so I need the lawyers to write what \(I\) announce. I asked him to do it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I've also asked
that you have adverse interest in these matters and you shouldn't be ruling on the case under law.

THE COURT: Okay. I am not sure what you're getting at. You can put whatever you want in writing.

Your participation in this hearing this morning, listen to me, it's over with. If you speak again because you're now - - you're pro se but you are violating some rules of decency and civility.

Don't speak again unless \(I\) speak to you. If you speak again, I'm going to take action against you that will be adverse to you immediately by my bailiff. Understand what \(I\) said, yes or no, it's all you can say?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay, that's one.
Okay. Come on up. All three are right here.

What else in this case, anything else?
MR. ROSE: We have a Motion to Continue this hearing is set for July the lith.

MR. BROWN: Judge, \(I\) noticed mine first.
THE COURT: Okay. Whoever noticed things
first.

MR. ROSE: Sorry.
MR. BROWN: I have two motions, Your Honor.

One is a Motion For Instructions Regarding Authority to Liquidate an IRA. The Estate, through a series of occurrences, ended up with the Decedent's IRA. It's at about 541,000. It holds equity. Although it is performing very well, it should be converted to cash.

It's not appropriate for the Estate to hold an IRA -- I don't believe it's appropriate for the Estate to hold an IRA that's holding equities that could --

THE COURT: Okay. Let's me hear from anyone else your position on this starting from my left to right, I'll catch everybody.

MR. ROYER: Jeff Royer, counsel for William Stansbury. We have no objection for.

MR. ROSE: We have no objection to
liquidating the IRA.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: \(I\) do have an objection.

THE COURT: Okay. What is it?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, Ben was going to get some information that appears that the
beneficiary is lost, it's bizarre. Again, we have another missing beneficiary on behalf of the Estates that could be a part of the furtherance of fraud.

We're waiting for the JP Morgan statements Ben was going to get. We haven't got 'em yet.

Until all that's decided, this IRA might be to a beneficiary and the covering up of the beneficiary might be part of the furtherance of a frauds that have already occurred to try to change beneficiaries in this case in this court before Your Honor by the same people, 1 believe. THE COURT: Okay. So is this -- is there a beneficiary on the IRA form?

MR. BROWN: We're not able to locate, apparently, a beneficiary form. That's why the Estate ended up with the IRA. But this has -this is --

THE COURT: So who --
MR. BROWN: -- this is not a distribution --
THE COURT: No, I understand that.
MR. BROWN: -- this is just to divert cash. THE COURT: All right. But are you going to keep the cash segregated in the Estate account and not be used for any other purpose without
order of the Court so in case a beneficiary of this IRA can be found, then the beneficiary would be entitled to the IRA as opposed to the Estate? MR. BROWN: That's correct. And Your Honor, it would actually stay in the IRA because once it's converted to cash, if it starts getting distributed then it's taxed. So that's why it's only to convert to cash.

THE COURT: Okay. But stay there, not used without court order.

MR. BROWN: Correct.
THE COURT: Is that --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If you're good with it, I'm good with that.

THE COURT: Okay, that's fine. As long as it stays that way.

MR. BROWN: I'll just need to write on the easel that.

THE COURT: I'm all right with that as long as it's -- so you folks do your due diligence. If you find a beneficiary, then the beneficiary will make a claim to it, but it will be held intact.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: By the way, Your Honor, that aspect was also not put into the
inventory of the Estate till after Tescher \& Spallina were being, you know, investigated and their notary arrested for forgery and fraudulent notarizations and all that nonsense, and so it appears that this is might, also, be part of a fraud, not just a missing beneficiary.

THE COURT: Well, it is what it is --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: -- and anyone can do what they think they need to do with it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. So it's stated for the record.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: So I'll include in the order it's to stay intact in the IRA until further order of the Court.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: My other motion is to inspect and take possession. This is mostly an appraisal so don't worry.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: There's tangible personal property that belongs to the Estate. It's located now in the Decedent's residence which is owned by the Decedent's Irrevocable Trust.

There have been questions raised as to whether or not some of the tangible personal property when the Decedent died was located in a condominium that was then told sold and the property was purportedly sent to the residence, so there's some question as to whether or not all that property that's on the appraisal is now located in the residence which is in st. Andrews Country Club.

So we called the appraiser and asked how much would it be for you to go into the residence at \(S t\). Andrews Country Club and simply do an inventory of your appraised items. And he said about \(\$ 500\) unless things are boxed up and very inaccessible.

THE COURT: So he's appraised the items already?

MR. BROWN: This is Robert Hittle is his name. He said about \(\$ 500\) if everything is accessible.

THE COURT: Well, what I'm getting at is, this which you've attached to your motion is the appraisal?

MR. BROWN: Correct. Which list all the items.

THE COURT: So the question is, did you inventory of where those items are now?

MR. BROWN: To do an inventory to make sure they're there at the residence. And then once we make that determination, then what \(I\) would envision the Court doing is just entering an order requiring whoever the trustee is, make sure those items stay there pending further order of the Court because storing them to be expensive.

THE COURT: Are all the items - so you are no the sure whether all the items that are on this appraisal are in the st. Andrews home or not?

MR. BROWN: I'm absolutely not sure and I am not qualified to walk in there and try to figure it out.

THE COURT: So where - But here it says, I'm looking quickly at the appraisal, where the items were when he did the appraisal.

MR. BROWN: Right.
THE COURT: So they're not there any longer?
MR. BROWN: Some of them -- the Decedent had
a condo on the beach, \(I\) believe, and had the house in st. Andrews. Some of them were in the condo, some of them were in the house.

When the condo was sold --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: -- during the --
THE COURT: So they either got moved to the house or they're somewhere else?

MR. BROWN: Correct.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Left to right, what do you say about the motion?

MR. ROYER: No objection.
MR. ROSE: We have some objection to this.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: Okay. The first thing is, this is an Eliot Bernstein motivated motion. All this stuff was inventoried in both properties.

It's an issue that the prior personal representatives had looked into and in one sense, if Eliot wants to pay the \(\$ 500\) for another appraisal, that's fine, but --

THE COURT: No. But he doesn't want an appraisal.

MR. ROSE: I mean, he wants the appraiser to go out and inventory it at a cost of, at a minimum, of \(\$ 500\) which we think if Eliot wants to have an inventory, he should bear the expense of it.

This is all -- the items were in two different residences, the residence - -

THE COURT: So the items that were in the home are purportedly still there. The items that are in the condominium, is that the issue, now that the condo's been sold, where are those items?

MR. ROSE: Some of the items, some furniture was left at the condo when it was sold. There may be some allocation issue at some point to do between the money that should go to the Estate and the money should go to the Trust.

It may not matter at the end of the day because the ten beneficiaries are the same in both. I think the prior PR's decided to table the issue 'til a later date. We will get a new PR at some point. Maybe the new \(P R\) should take this up.

You know, my client has --
THE COURT: Okay. I understand your position.

MR. ROSE: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. Eliot, what do you say? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, first that his position is argued improperly because he's
adverse.

And second, we need a new appraiser. I saw that --

THE COURT: That's not the motion, though.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: NO, I know, but in -just for record.

THE COURT: Well, no, but \(I\) don't want to deal with an item that's not before of me.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't want you to rule on an appraiser going back there of the same guy.

THE COURT: Okay, that's the motion. So I'm asking what your position is.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm telling you why we're objecting to that.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Stansbury's attorneys had put in that they question the appraisals on these items and \(I\) do to.

We believe we found some evidence that there might be fencing of jewels in some of the appraisals done by the former \(P R^{\prime} s\) who are involved in frauding documents, forging documents, all that good stuff.

And so now we found out, reported it to the
police, they have condo investigations of this stuff, and so Ben Brown, you know, didn't know - - when we looked at the record they submitted, which is shotty, there's not a single thing that says they paid for moving costs of any furniture to the st. Andrews home and Ben couldn't find it either. And, you know, we - I said we do and this is what he did.

So you know, \(I\) support that it be done but by a different appraiser that's qualified. THE COURT: Well, \(I\) don't know that you need an appraiser to do an inventory. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, the inventory, correct.

THE COURT: Because it's not going to be appraised. Basically what you're saying is, here's the appraisal. They have, you know, a bunch of items --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But anything involved in the past.

THE COURT: Where are those items, that's the question, Mr. Brown?

MR. BROWN: The question is, whether the items are there at 77020 Lyons Head and whether or not they're the same items that appear on the
appraisal.
The reason we called Mr. Hittle is because he's the one who actually looked at them, photographed them and described the items on the appraisal.

THE COURT: If he'll do it for a maximum, a maximum not a minimum, a maximum of \(\$ 500\) I'll allow it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can we get someone else --

THE COURT: No, he can do it because he's the one who can identify --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But he's involved with the prior guys --

THE COURT: But here's the thing, it's going to cost more to have some one clean and I rather, you know, use the money more wisely and allow him just to identify.

So he can do this, but Mr. Brown, someone else has to be present when he does this.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can \(I\) be there?

THE COURT: Okay. Well --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't been to my parent's home since they locked me out.

MR. BROWN: If I'm there it's \$350 an hour,
so it defeats the purpose.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: We object to the
Eliot Bernstein --
THE COURT: Yeah, I rather not have an active party there.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can \(I\) be there as a witness?

THE COURT: But here's the thing, if you're there, then they're going to want someone to be there and all of sudden, it's going to be a show.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't mind.
THE COURT: I'm trying to avoid that from happening.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I know, but I'm trying to avoid further fraud.

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, may I?
Mr. Bernstein, Ted Bernstein who's the Trustee of the trust that owns the house will unlock the door and stay outside.

And this gentleman's a professional. I think we could trust him to go inventory it last time and \(I\) think if we let him in by himself, \(I\) don't think he's going to it steal anything.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He's directly involved
in the prior frauds in advancing these schemes on the court and everybody else to get beneficiaries --

THE COURT: Okay, here's what \(I\) will allow. So, on the date of the appointment for this fellow to go to the house, the house, I assume, is locked. Ted Bernstein has the key? MR. ROSE: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. All right. So Eliot, you can be there as well. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Thank you. THE COURT: But not to go in the house, okay. So you can watch the appraiser go in there --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. THE COURT: -- he'll do his thing, he'll come out. And assuming he's not carrying boxes of items, it's probably a good idea he's not stealing anything from inside, okay, because that's the question. I mean, but he can do -Okay. You can write that in the order. You both can watch to make sure he doesn't prolong any items in there.

MR. BROWN: I'll write that. THE COURT: Yeah, write that in. Have fun.

What else?
MR. ROSE: We have a Motion to Continue. There's some hearings set for July 11th. I addressed it at the prior hearing. There was some confusion, so \(I\) withdraw the order I was going to submit and start from scratch.

There's two hearings on July 11th. One is Eliot's Motion For Trust Construction in the Shirley Trust and one is his objections to the accountings of Tescher \& Spallina.

THE COURT: In the Simon Trust?
MR. ROSE: In the Simon Trust -- in the Simon Estate.

Tescher \& Spallina are unavailable for those days. I've obtained on behalf of Ted as the Trustee of his father's trust an extension to obtain -- to make objections until time after the -- sometime after the \(P R\) is appointed because the \(P R\) is the one who really should prosecute the objections. So we've asked to continue those hearings.

Everyone was in agreement. And I did bring it last week, thought it was an agreement. Mr. Bernstein objected. So I withdraw what we did last week and now we're just formally asking
you to continue those hearings for a variety of reasons.

One is, we have two hours set aside. We have to have, maybe, half a day or a day trial on a Trust Instruction Action or maybe more, there's other parties involved and the objections to the accounting are going to take a long time.

What we've asked you to do because there's a myriad of --

THE COURT: Let me just --
MR. ROSE: We have to have status conference --

THE COURT: One of the problems is that Eliot says he can't get hearing dates. And so, at least, what you're telling me is set on July 11th, one of those matters is his Motion For Trust Construction, so why can't that be heard?

MR. ROSE: Well, it's going to take a day or two to have that heard. We need discovery.

We'd asked for -- what I'd suggest is, if we have a status conference on that day, we can go through all the motions that are pending and figure out what actually needs to be heard, what's agreed upon and, you know, set the case to where it's manageable.

To have the Trust Construction, first of all, it's filed in the wrong case. I don't know if it's been properly noticed to everybody -THE COURT: That, I don't know. I know you tell me there's a hearing date. Beyond that, \(I\) don't know whether it's done properly or not, but that's a matter in the shirley's case.

MR. ROSE: That's in the -- Yeah, I filed it this Motion to Continue in both cases. THE COURT: No. But Eliot's Trust Construction motion is in the Shirley Bernstein case?

MR. ROSE: Correct. In the Shirley
Bernstein Estate, it's merely construed as the Shirley Bernstein Trust, it's not properly -THE COURT: Do you have a copy of your motion that's set?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: NO, but it's in Simon, you can look it up on the record. I have a docket here.

THE COURT: So is it in Simon's Trust case or -- Simon's Estate or Shirley's Estate?

MR. ROSE: The Trust Construction, I think, is in Shirley's Estate. THE COURT: And they say no. So \(I\) kind of
would like to know that.
MR. BROWN: Okay. I probably have a copy of it.

MR. ROSE: It is in the Simon Estate. So we have in the simon Estate, they's a document that wants to construe as the Shirley

Bernstein Trust, it's
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: I just heard Eliot say this has nothing to do with the Shirley Bernstein Estate. This is Petition For Construction of Testament Trust of Removal of Trustee And Trust Accounting in the simon case. That's what it pertains to, all about Simon?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I thought so. THE COURT: Well, we have -- as far as the accounting goes, there's been an accounting, there are objections to the accounting, I have to hear that, so --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No trust accounting, neither Estate. God knows how many rules that violated.

THE COURT: I am not sure why I can't hear this motion. I mean, assuming -- I mean, he obviously has to make sure everyone's served and
it has to be done pursuant to the rules.
Okay. I'm going to hear this motion.
MR. ROSE: There is --
THE COURT: But the hearing, at the same time on the objections to the accounting, we're not going to do that because we're never going to have time. This will take two hours in and of itself anyway and it's -- You know, it's just not helpful to try to squeeze things in.

Mr. Brown, what do you say?
MR. BROWN: Well, my suggestion is, Your Honor, I had tried to set the Motion to Appoint Personal Representative for July 16 th.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: And I think that Mr. Glasko and Mr. Feaman have issues with July 16 th, but July 11 th would be clear.

And it makes sense to go ahead and have the Motion to Remove the Trustee, who's Ted Bernstein, and petition to appoint -- the competing petitions to appoint the personal representative --

THE COURT: All right. I like that idea because \(I\) think we need to get \(a \operatorname{PR}\) in here if we can.
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MR. BROWN: I agree.
THE COURT: Okay. Any reason we can't do both of those on that date?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, Your Honor --
THE COURT: Well, because if I remove a trustee, \(I\) need someone to fill the blank there, I need a PR.

MR. ROSE: That's not going to be a two-hour trial, that's going to be an all day affair, at least.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: And --
THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: This is my concern; we have -there was a block of time on July 16 th. And \(I\) suggested that -- everyone agreed last week, other than Eliot, that it made sense to have a status conference.

THE COURT: Hold on. Let me take a look at my calendar and see that time because \(I\) want to make sure we have enough time to finish this.

Okay. I can give you three-and-a-half hours on that day.

MR. ROYER: Your Honor, if I may,
Mr. Feaman is in mediation on that day.

THE COURT: On the 11th?
MR. ROYER: He was just on the calendar on the 11th.

THE COURT: But everybody -- You know, I'm not going to get a day where someone doesn't have something, that's the problem.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, respectfully, Mr. Feaman, he has a dog in the fight in the form of Mr. Stansbury, but he's not asking to be -- Mr. Stansbury is not asking to be Trustee nor is he asking to be personal representative.

THE COURT: Yeah, I'm not too concerned about him in this hearing.

MR. ROSE: I think he has filed a motion to appoint Eliot Bernstein as personal representative.

MR. ROYER: It's Eliot's motion.
THE COURT: SO I have scheduled now on the
16th for half a day the Petition to Appoint PR.
MR. BROWN: Correct.
THE COURT: So why don't we do this, we're going to start these hearings on the 11th. I'll give you three-and-a-half hours.

If we don't finish, we move over to the 16 th
which we have a half a day. We just have to bifurcate it that day.

MR. ROSE: Okay.
THE COURT: So I'm going to deal with this Petition For Construction and Removal. We're not doing accountings and then we're going to deal with the appointment of the \(P R\) in consecutive time, so those two matters will take care of those two days. Hold on one second, let me sign this.

Okay. What else? Anything else from you?
MR. ROSE: Well, we still have to have a status conference.

THE COURT: We'll discuss that. I mean, yeah, before you all leave, at some point we'll status.

Yes?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, I object.
THE COURT: TO what part?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: TO everything he said because he's adverse.

THE COURT: He didn't say anything to object to. He just said can we have a status conference.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I object to some of
the stuff he put in the record.
THE COURT: Yeah. But now I'm giving you the hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Because it's false.
THE COURT: But this is UMC, I am not taking testimony.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay, gotcha. The only thing \(I\) want that \(I\) think is important first, is that you hear if he is adverse --

THE COURT: I'm going to hear everything that the rules allow.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Someone will call a witness, we'll have a hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, no. My question, I put in motions saying that his adverse interest and cannot represent it any party as counsel because he's a direct fact and material witness, is involved in the perpetration of the frauded (sic) document, he's been police investigations --

THE COURT: Is there a formal Motion to Disqualify?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, it's all on there. It's the one \(I\) asked you to disqualify
for the same reasons.
THE COURT: I don't represent anybody, so it couldn't be for the same reasons.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, under adverse interest.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a Motion to Disqualify from him?

MR. ROSE: I was going at that approach, without comment. This was filed --

THE COURT: Yeah. So let me review it for legal sufficiency, that's what \(I\) have to do. All right.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Sir, I voluntarily ask you to disqualify because you have adverse interest if you're a material and fact witness, your name's on a bunch of documents --

THE COURT: Okay. I'll look at this motion when I get off the bench at some point and I'll either rule on it based upon its sufficiency or I'll set it for hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. But then -okay.

THE COURT: But right now we have these hearings dates.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Before any hearing
happen, we you need --
THE COURT: I'll rule on this before the 11th?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's for you. It's got \(a\) little bit of him. You want me to file a separate motion --

THE COURT: This one is for - hold on. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: In fact, Your Honor, this document they're trying to become privileged that's not between attorneys and clients is a threatening letter that talks about legal abusive strategies --

THE COURT: Okay. Slow down one second. I thought this motion had to do with Mr. Rose, it doesn't, this has to do with me.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: Right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: But it does deal with him, Your Honor. THE COURT: Is there another motion that deals separately with him?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, but if you want, I'll do it. THE COURT: No. Sure -- no, I'm not inviting
that. Okay.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He should voluntarily leave. I mean, he has bar rules and judicial --

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, this is UMC. We have a big crowd here.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. I'll rule on this and then -- was there a prior motion to disqualify me?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. So the rule is different when there's a successive motion.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The bottom line is, that before we have those hearings on the 11 th or 16th, or whatever you just said, we have to hear if the counsel and the Judge are legally qualified --

THE COURT: I just told you I'm going to rule on this in the next day or two.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You know they were involved.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, you are starting to move past what the UMC allows me to do.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: File something in writing and

I'll look at it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I will. You got it.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me have the orders.

Okay, bye. Next case.
Write out the orders to make room --
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: By the way, Your
Honor, part of this is my family's in danger. That privileged letter that he's trying to hide
from your eyes and federal investigators and everybody else, is a letter that talks about using abusive legal strategies to harass me and my father's friends -- listen.

THE COURT: No, no, stop, stop.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: You're beyond what UMC allows to you do.

MR. BROWN: That is an e-mail that Eliot wrote to me and \(I\) told him that \(I\) would give you, talks about Mr. Rose's duty to disqualify himself.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: That one I'm going to need the original to certify JP Morgan. And this is the other one, that \(I\) do not need back, just a copy. Thank you, Judge.
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with nine spikes of titanium nails cutting me out. But he wouldn't -- this is the most important hearing in the world, so I'm here. Let's go.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. I have -- let me address one thing. I appreciate that you did something different this time, and I'm not sure it was intentional, but if it was, good for you. You changed the style of your pleading from "emergency" to "urgent." Was that intentional?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't like to call an emergency unless there is an emergency.

THE COURT: So that was good, meaning -- but here's the problem. I'm going to ask you to just be aware of this. It doesn't take a whole lot to let me know if someone needs something rescheduled, okay? The filing in this case was 331 pages.

MR. BERNSTEIN: That was the evidence added to it.

MR. ROSE: But see, that's what you're not supposed to do.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: So the clerk's file, they have to take time to scan everything in. They have no discretion if you give them something.

And so, for example, when I went to print out

\section*{6}
your pleading, I didn't pay attention to how long it was at first, and then I saw it was 331 pages. I had to --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I not put exhibits in? THE COURT: What?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I not put exhibits in?
THE COURT: Yeah, you don't put -- in a motion, you don't put your evidence in.

MR. BERNSTEIN: For exhibits?
THE COURT: Yeah, you don't have to if it's an exhibit. But a motion to continue, it doesn't -it's almost beyond the realm of possibilities that you'll have, for a motion to continue, based upon -- if you have a medical reason, you say, Judge, I have a medical reason; what exhibits do I need other than maybe if you thought I needed a verification that you had a medical procedure.

MR. BERNSTEIN: It was just that I had told him a lot of times, so I put in all of the correspondences.

THE COURT: That's unnecessary, okay?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I apologize.
THE COURT: I get it right away like that.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I apologize.
THE COURT: While we're here on the topic --
so let's go over because I think I want to -- we need to be able to do this for everyone's sake -what it means to have to an emergency hearing in probate, okay?

So we really don't have -- it's being drafted now -- a specific administrative order that deals exactly with that topic in probate itself. We have it in civil and we have one in family. But now we're drafting one.

But the general one is that it's a matter of life and death, meaning that the clerk has to stop what they're doing. If I'm in the middle of someone else's hearing, I can't hear their matter. I have to rule on the emergency right away because if I don't rule in the next five minutes, someone may die.

In a probate case, that's really unusual. I checked around. No one said it's ever happened in the history of probate cases. So we don't really get that.

In family, by example, when someone files a motion for not necessarily an emergency hearing bu for relief and they say, the child is at the airport boarding the plane to a country that doesn't accept the Hate Convention, Homeland

Security says you've got 15 minutes to stop, otherwise, you'll never see the child again, that's what that means.

So because -- and that's the reason why those motions are getting denied, because they're not emergencies.

However, we do allow you, if you want to -this is for everybody -- to have a hearing, because I rarely grant emergency relief without a hearing. I mean, that has to be -- that means I'm doing an ex-parte without the other side being heard. But if you want a hearing and you want it to be done sooner than later, whether it's because it's important or because you're having trouble scheduling, put the word "urgent," and then that comes to me. And then I'll look at it and then I'll be involved, which I'm now even more accessible to scheduling because I now have the computer on my desk. They actually gave me a new one here, it's bigger, for scheduling purposes.

And the other -- because some of the filings of emergency motions were 90 pages and 100 pages and the clerk just has to -- I mean, the system just shuts down for everybody else. So it is what it is.

THE WITNESS: Absolutely.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did I hand you these three documents outside of court today?
A. I believe so.
Q. I'd like you to take a look at the three exhibits. The first one that we're going to look at -I'll make it easy.

MR. ROSE: Do you want me to mark this as
Exhibit 1 ?
THE COURT: Whatever you want.
(Petitioner's Exhibit No. 1 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. I'm handing you what I've marked as Petitioner's Exhibit 1, which is a countercomplaint that you filed in the case called Eliot Bernstein versus Oppenheimer \& Company. Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. Did you file that paper?
A. I believe so.
Q. If you turn to the first green tab on the side, paragraph 235 --
already told you they did, correct?
Q. Do you believe that somebody could find the privileged e-mail by going to that e-mail --
A. I believe the court order addresses that.
Q. And if you go to --
A. It said I shouldn't forward by e-mail the
letter. I haven't done that.
Q. And then if you look at paragraph 236, "That in keeping with the court order, you will not republish the e-mail, but you will direct the Court to available sites where it exists publicly and eternally in the worldwide web."

Do you see that?
A. Correct.
Q. And then the last sentence of paragraph 236, you incorporate by reference the privileged e-mail in its entirety in this lawsuit that you filed?
A. No. I put in a link to a website.
Q. And then it says, "Incorporate by referencing in entirety herein."
A. Okay, yeah.
Q. Correct?
A. Yeah.
Q. That would include what's in that website?
A. Correct.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Did you write that paragraph?
A. I did.
Q. And in that paragraph, you advised that
"Claims of privilege were levied in attempts to cover up
the documents that both threatens Eliot with
forcefulness and aggressiveness and displays a wide variety of breaches of fiduciary duty in the estate."

Did you write that?
A. I did.
Q. And you don't believe that discloses the substance of the e-mail that Ted sent to me?
A. I don't believe that violates the Court's order.
Q. That wasn't my question.

Does that contain the substance of what was in the e-mail that there was threaten to forcefulness and aggressiveness?
A. No. That is a link to a website that somebody else published.
Q. And in the website, someone could find the privileged e-mail?
A. Possibly. I didn't publish it.
Q. Do you believe --
A. I believe parts are up there, but somebody has
Q. And you would agree the privileged e-mail is at that website?
A. I don't know, I said.

Have you checked it?
Q. It's your testimony, sir. Are you telling the Court you don't believe --
A. I don't know if the whole e-mail is there or what they published. I know those are links I was given to that document.
Q. And it's your testimony --
A. And it's a whole blog on it, actually, on the Ted Bernstein report.
(Petitioner's Exhibit No. 2 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. If you look at what we'll mark as Exhibit 2 --
A. The order was that I not e-mail the document to anybody or forward it. I didn't do any of that.
Q. Exhibit No. 2 is an --
A. Or republish the link of somebody else's.
Q. Exhibit No. 2 is an e-mail dated

September 4th. Did you send this e-mail to me and numerous other people?
A. I did.
Q. If you turn to the second page with a green
tab, did you write, "As the privileged letter revealed and Ted's admissions" --

THE COURT: Wait, wait. Where are you now?
THE WITNESS: The second page of the e-mail.
MR. ROSE: I'm on the e-mail from
September 4th. It should be the three things in
the package with the green tabs. I'm sorry, Your
Honor, we switched to a different document.
THE COURT: All right. I see September 4th
e-mail from Eliot to Alan. Okay, got it.
MR. ROSE: And numerous other people.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. So page 2, did you write, "As the privileged letter revealed and Ted's admissions on the stand reflect, you and Ted have engaged in legal strategy against of 'force and aggression.'"

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
(Petitioner's Exhibit No. 3 was marked for identification.)
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. And the third document, which is marked as Exhibit 3, is a motion in opposition, which you filed in the Shirley Bernstein estate. Can you identify that --
A. The one where is John Pankowski (phonetic)

22
fired?
THE COURT: I missed the question.
THE WITNESS: So did I.
THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. ROSE: I'm onto the next exhibit.
THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Exhibit No. 3 is the motion in opposition. Did you file that document in the courthouse on August 28th of this year?

THE COURT: Do I have that?
MR. ROSE: It's the third -- the three things
that I --
THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: One, two.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. ROSE: I have an extra copy, Your Honor.
THE WITNESS: You probably have it in your computer.

MR. ROSE: This would be Exhibit 3, Your Honor. I apologize.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is called, in the Shirley Bernstein Estate, a motion in opposition, et cetera.

Go ahead.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. If you go to page 4, there is a tab, another green tab, that should be on the side. If it's not --
A. No.
Q. Paragraph 5, "That Alan attempted to smear, harass, defame and -- Eliot, et cetera, according to the alleged trustee, Theodore, under oath in these" --

THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. ROSE: I'm sorry.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. -- "of forcefulness and aggression in dealing with Eliot. This strategy was also stated and detailed in an e-mail sent to Eliot by Theodore that contained a letter Theodore wrote to Alan, a claim they intended on using this strategy of force and aggression on Eliot and all those who are helping him, too."

Did you write that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Are there numerous other places in which you have referenced the forcefulness and aggression and the facts that came out --
A. Yep.
Q. -- the e-mail?
A. Yeah. I think all over the place.
Q. Next, do you serve every single piece of paper
in this case on every single person in my law firm that you know their e-mail address?
A. I've been serving --

THE COURT: Listen to his question.
THE WITNESS: I am. I've been serving the
people that I listed as respondents in these
matters, and as counter defendants. And I've asked
Alan Rose repeatedly to give me their attorneys so
I could contact them, but he has refused, God
knows, 10,15 requests for who their lawyers are
that are representing them so I could properly
serve the lawyers. But since he refuses to give me
that information, yes, I've been serving the people
at his law firm that I am suing.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Do you serve the bookkeeper at a law firm with every piece of paper --
A. It says all employees, everything. So yeah, I make a -- yeah, I am suing her.
Q. And do you serve every piece of paper on everyone in all of the offices of our law firm?
A. I've served you, the marshal served you or somebody, right? Did they, yes or?

MR. ROSE: Mr. Bernstein, answer the question. THE WITNESS: Well, I was just --

THE COURT: No. No.
THE WITNESS: Did I serve -- yeah, I served -until you tell me who their lawyers are, I'm going to keep serving to people I'm supposed to. They're on the service list.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Do you serve every single receptionist in both offices?
A. I served people at your office that I'm suing.
Q. Well, are you going to continue to do it?
A. Unless I'm ordered not to, I have to. I'm serving documents that are respondents and defendants. You won't give me their lawyers.

Who is you representing you, for example?
Q. Have you served process on the receptionist or the secretary or the associates or the legal assistants?
A. Not yet. I asked you to waive it, but you refused to waive yours in your own lawsuit. And you're making this expensive in trying, but yeah.

And if they have lawyers, I'm more than happy to serve their lawyers. I've asked you 100 times.
Q. Have you cooperated in scheduling a date for your deposition?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you believe I have the right to take your
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\section*{deposition?}
A. Absolutely. If you served -- if -- yes, I do, at this point.
Q. Do you recall the Court ordering that I'm entitled to take your deposition prior to the hearing on your pending motions and petitions including the petitions to remove Ted?
A. Yes. But I had no hearing scheduled until last week. So the 30 times you tried to schedule a deposition were all abusive and harassment, and there was no upcoming hearing. And I told you I was in medical procedures that are causing me tremendous headaches. I'm on medicines, I'm on heavy narcotic.

THE WITNESS: Your Honor, would you like to see the list I'm on since their July hearing? I
brought it with me today for you. It's the Publix receipts.

THE COURT: I don't need to see the receipts. You just told me about it.

THE WITNESS: Well, you can see I don't have teeth and I have a broken face where all my bones were shattered. When the teeth are out, I have extreme headaches that a mortal man wouldn't be here.

THE COURT: All right. Let's focus.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Yeah, I'm sorry. BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did I call you a week ago to try to schedule a hearing on September 24th, and you advised me you were unavailable that day?
A. I did.
Q. Did you then call me a couple of days later and advise that the Court had three hours available on September 24th, and you were now available and wanted to have your hearings heard on that day?
A. Well, what happened was you were harassing me to all of these -- trying to schedule all of these hearings you canceled and depositions you canceled that you never even notified me about. So I called the Court to find out when we could have the thing that Martin Colin, Honorable Martin Colin, wanted to hear next, which was the removal of Ted.

And since you were trying to schedule all of these things, I called to get it done quickly because we have evidence that assets are now missing and that you've told the Court one thing, which we'll hear on my contempt proceeding against you next at -- that now we have deposition statement that say you sold furniture --

THE COURT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: -- that you said transferred
before.
THE COURT: You're way beyond the scope of the question.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.
MR. ROSE: Nothing further.
THE COURT: So before you respond, I have a question --

MR. ROSE: I did forget one other aspect.
THE COURT: Sure.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did you tell us that you sent the e-mail, privileged e-mail, to \(\mathbf{2 , 0 0 0}\) people between the time you received it on a Thursday evening and the following morning when we were in front of Judge Colin?
A. No. What I said was that I had sent the e-mail to many of the people who were named in there to be abused by you guys. And then what happened was I believed I posted it on social media, where just like on Facebook I have like 4,000 friends, let alone all of the other places I'm socially connected, which is everywhere. That's everywhere.

So I believe that thousands of people have that information. And in fact, I'm certain quite a lot of them do. And I posted things for everybody to delete it, but I'm not exactly sure how that works on Facebook
and Instagram and everywhere else. But, okay.
Q. Do you recall testifying on May 23rd that you sent it to your friends who are lawyers, you sent it to a number of people; you got so busy sending it to people because it scared you that by the time you were done sending it to people, your wife stopped you and said it was time to go to court?
A. I do recall that.
Q. That would mean from 10:00 at night until the morning when it was time to come to court, you were sending the e-mail to people?
A. Who said I started at 10:00 in the morning -10:00 at night?
Q. Well, you got Ted's e-mail, and then about less than an hour, you got my e-mail telling you not to send it to the people.

Had you sent it to anybody --
A. -- until the next morning when I got up.
Q. How many people have you advised --
A. Every single person I sent an e-mail, and I've given you and the Court copies -- and I regret that you continue to try to mislead the Court -- that I have been provided the e-mails that I sent and telling those people to delete and destroy.
Q. Well, there are about four people that you
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sent e-mails that you provided as part of your --
A. However many there were.
Q. So how does four people equal 2,000 people?
A. I just told you, on Facebook, when you post something, there are thousands of people that can access that publication.
Q. And did you remove everything from Facebook?
A. I think. It's kind of hard to know. I posted people to delete it.
Q. Did you tell people that they could -- they should decide for themselves what to do with it because you were going to appeal it?
A. No. What I told them to do, if you read the letter, is to delete it. I gave them the Judge's order. I complied fully 100 percent with Judge Colin's order. I told them to delete it, blah.

Then I said, because Judge Colin's order is confusing, it says, "If Eliot appeals, he should," whatever.

So I said to everybody, I'm not a lawyer, but I'm appealing this. So in the interim, I don't know what you do with your copies; contact a lawyer. But you misquoted and took out that little one tiny section and left the two other ends off.
Q. You told me --
A. -- misread to some other kind of statement, which is more of what's going on here, but okay. We'll get to my turn next.
Q. You told the people, "I'm not sure what you're supposed to do in the meantime with your copies," correct?
A. I told them that pending the appeal, they should consult with a lawyer; that I'm not sure what to do on appeal. I looked up the rules, but I'm not a lawyer, and it doesn't say much about the appeal. And Judge Colin's order didn't say anything about Eliot. So I told them to seek legal counsel, which I thought was what they should do. You knew that people were objecting to destroying it.
Q. Did you appeal the order?
A. I haven't yet.
Q. Did you advise the people after your deadline to appeal a file [sic] that you were no longer appealing it, and they should delete all copies and return them and destroy them as Judge Colin ordered you to do? It's a yes or no.
A. I've already advised them to delete the e-mail and what to do, and gave them the rules and gave them Judge Colin's order. They're not, you know...

MR. ROSE: Nothing further.

THE COURT: Okay. So here's what I want to do. Stay there, Eliot.

Do you have any other witnesses?
MR. ROSE: No.
THE COURT: You mentioned in opening statement that there was a designation that you made -- this is to Mr. Rose -- about who Mr. Bernstein should serve by e-mail. I need to see that designation.

MR. ROSE: I'm not sure I have it. It's filed with the Court. It's in the court record. It would be -- let me look to see if I have a copy of it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Do we have it, Candy?
MR. ROSE: The designation only lists one e-mail. It's mine only. I didn't list any secondaries. And I have e-mailed it to Mr. Bernstein, and he refuses.

Now, as a matter of law, he has no right to serve somebody until they've been served with process. So he can't send anything to anybody in my law firm. By law, he can't --

THE COURT: I don't want you arguing that.
MR. ROSE: Sorry.
THE COURT: Let me do something. Let me get the case back on the computer.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & 33 \\
\hline 1 & Do you know when you sent that e-mail \\
\hline 2 & designation? \\
\hline 3 & MR. ROSE: I think it was in -- I think it was \\
\hline 4 & in like June or July, that time frame. I think -- \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: Okay. Did you get -- \\
\hline 6 & Mr. Bernstein, Eliot, did you get the designation \\
\hline 7 & by Mr. Rose as to who would receive e-mails? \\
\hline 8 & MR. BERNSTEIN: No. \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: You don't have a copy of it? \\
\hline 10 & MR. BERNSTEIN: No. \\
\hline 11 & THE COURT: I'm talking to Mr. Rose now. \\
\hline 12 & MR. ROSE: Let me see the e-mail. \\
\hline 13 & MR. BERNSTEIN: And Your Honor, I've asked \\
\hline 14 & them if he was going to be accepting service for \\
\hline 15 & everybody. \\
\hline 16 & THE COURT: Well, service is different. This \\
\hline 17 & is now the issue of whether the e-mail rules are \\
\hline 18 & being complied with. \\
\hline 19 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, they're all respondents, \\
\hline 20 & all those people. \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: But that's -- it may be different. \\
\hline 22 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Tricky? \\
\hline 23 & THE COURT: Hold on. I have to find this. \\
\hline 24 & MR. ROSE: In point of fact, the rule is self \\
\hline 25 & executing, Your Honor. What the rule says is if I \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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haven't filed a designation, you're to serve me at the e-mail address that I have listed with the Florida Bar. But you're not to serve parties.

He continues to serve all these that are represented by counsel. And there is no right to serve anyone in my law firm other than me.

I'm having the document e-mailed to me.
THE COURT: You need to, because I'm just having trouble --

MR. BERNSTEIN: They were all respondents in this matter, if you look at them.

THE COURT: They may be, but if you're -- I'm not talking about, right now, if I'm following everybody, Mr. Bernstein's attempt to serve process on someone named in a lawsuit. That's a different subject, I think.

The question is, can you e-mail papers to them?

And Mr. Rose, you're saying that he shouldn't do it because he should only e-mail them to you.

Mr. Bernstein says, in response, that if he e-mails something, he's not going to e-mail to another party a pleading to you, Mr. Rose, because you're not representing that party.

That's what you're saying, correct,

Mr. Bernstein?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct, sir.
THE COURT: But they're not served yet. So the question is, can you start the e-mail process in advance of them even being served because it's the service of process that lets them know that you're a party; otherwise, they tend --

MR. BERNSTEIN: But they're --
THE COURT: -- they don't know the lawsuit is taking place that you filed.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I also ask them all to waive, and these are lawyers and this is going to run up huge expenses to me.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that.
MR. ROSE: Your Honor --
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- and they refused to waive
THE COURT: Hold on.
MR. ROSE: It does raise a completely
different issue. What Mr. Bernstein -- Eliot Bernstein is an experienced litigant. Even though he's pro se, he's been litigating with people for 15 or 20 years as a pro se. So what he does is he goes to the clerk's office without filing anything --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I object.

THE COURT: Hold on.
MR. ROSE: -- and again, it's my name as a respondent. If you look at the docket sheet, he has the word "respondent" after my name.

THE COURT: To what pleading?
MR. ROSE: Just to the docket sheet. He goes to the clerk's office, and somehow either he does it or --

THE COURT: With every pleading, he serves --
MR. BERNSTEIN: I paid the clerk, which you told me to pay to make them respondents. I paid \$3 for each respondent. They're all listed in the Court that way. That's what was I advised to do.

THE COURT: The respondent is a person who is the recipient of a petition filed by a petitioner, who I assume is Mr. Bernstein, et cetera.

So if you're named a respondent, Mr. Rose, then in the heading, that's what you're talking about? You're a respondent in the heading?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, sir.
MR. ROSE: I don't think it's -- I don't even understand the point of it other than it's all designed to --

THE COURT: Tell me what it physically looks like, you're a respondent in the heading. Give me
an example. Show me.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Individually and professionally.

THE COURT: I see that. I see your name is there.

MR. ROSE: It's not a procedure that's recognized by Florida law, but if you look on the docket sheet, he lists my name --

THE COURT: I see, "Respondent Alan Ross, personally, and Alan Rose, professionally."

MR. ROSE: I'm not a respondent in -- I'm a counsel of record for somebody. I'm under the -I'm serving as counsel in the case. And what he does is he adds the name "respondent," and then he says I'm a party.

His whole goal is to get us to quit or step aside. He's already moved to disqualify us. It's not a legally recognized thing to just call someone a respondent.

THE COURT: Why don't you dismiss --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Respondent --
THE COURT: -- yourself as a party if you're -- were you served with process?

MR. ROSE: No.
THE COURT: So --
question: Are you being joined as a party through a pleading filed by Mr. Bernstein?

MR. ROSE: No.
THE COURT: So Mr. Bernstein, listen carefully.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I didn't hear that. I'm so sorry. I was peeling --

THE COURT: There is an estate case open --
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- my gums off.
MR. ROSE: In the Shirley Bernstein and the Simon Bernstein Estate.

THE COURT: I'm looking at Simon right now, which is 2012CP4391.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I see here that you have named as a respondent Mr. Rose, personally and professionally.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: So is there a pleading that you have filed or someone else has filed in which Mr. Rose is being sued in that capacity in this case?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: What's that pleading?
MR. BERNSTEIN: All of them, the petitions and

MR. BERNSTEIN: You haven't been served with any process, Alan?

THE COURT: No.
If you're a named party in a lawsuit, then you would -- and you don't know why you're there or think you shouldn't be there, you need to move to dismiss yourself or strike yourself from that part of the pleading, and then I can consider doing that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And he is served --
THE COURT: Stop. Stop.
MR. ROSE: We're talking about two different things. He has now filed two counterclaims against me. We're going to deal with those another day.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: But in the estate proceeding, I'm not a party to the estate proceeding in any way, shape or form. There is no basis to make me a party to the estate proceeding.

THE COURT: But --
MR. BERNSTEIN: You were involved in the fraud, in the forgery --

THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- advancing us.
THE COURT: If he wants -- so here's the
everything. I've listed him as a respondent and notified him.

MR. ROSE: And when he is --
THE COURT: You listed him as a respondent.
MR. BERNSTEIN: But when he gets served --
THE COURT: Slow down. In an estate case, the actions that get filed in this estate case are governed by the rules of procedure. They are -- if they're lawsuits, they're adversary proceedings.
They're either mandatory or they're discretionary.
You have to ask for permission and you have to have a special heading for them tacked onto the
pleading. And I would have to see what the adversary pleading is that supposedly would bring Mr. Rose or any other attorney from the point of an attorney to being a named party.

And I assume it's you who are the petitioners in that actions.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: And so I'm going to deal with that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And by the way, in Florida, when he accepts -- when he gets the petition served on him and accepts it at his e-mail address that's registered with the Court, he's accepted service of
that document. He's a respondent. He could have filed an opposition pleading, but he's refusing to do that.

By the way, he's also been served process in the countercomplaint of his own lawsuit he filed while I'm infirmed and he forced me to do all this nonsense.

THE COURT: Hold on.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Anyways, he's now been served by the marshal. And that's after he waives -wouldn't waive service so I had to pay 2-, 3-, \(\$ 400\), whatever, that I don't have as you know because of the frauds that have held up my inheritance. But he's now served. And he should have counsel on several things.

He's being accused of very serious crimes; fraud, legal malpractice, breaches --

THE COURT: Those are not crimes. You're in the wrong court if he's -- you don't serve someone with crimes.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I've served civil fraud or the counts --

THE COURT: Civil is different than --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Right, civil fraud --
THE COURT: Be careful about your wording.
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MR. BERNSTEIN: -- malpractice and about 100 other torts

THE COURT: I see one now. Hold on. Hold on.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Have you notified your counsel?

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, quiet.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. So this is how I want you to do it: I'm going to let you be heard, Eliot, right now on the issue of compliance or not with my July 18th order, of 2014, dealing with the privileged letter or e-mail. Go ahead.

MR. BERNSTEIN: So I can call witnesses and such?

THE COURT: Well, you can call witnesses in a second, but I want you to finish your testimony first because you're on the stand.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm confused.
THE COURT: So you're now able -- you can show cause why you shouldn't be held in contempt, and then you can call witnesses.

MR. BERNSTEIN: So I can start?
THE COURT: Right from there.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I have to get my stuff.
THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, sir.
Okay. The first --
THE COURT: Go back there. Take your stuff and go back.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, Your Honor. He says that I didn't comply. Was that the first thing?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. BERNSTEIN: In fact, I complied early, before you ever told me. I went back. The first time I learned of this privileged claim, you told me to read the rules; I read them. I knew I had a right to challenge, but I didn't want to, you know, get in trouble. I didn't quite understand what happened that day in court, so I notified everybody I had sent the e-mail to. Here's the rules: Destroy and delete, is what it says. And you have to, you know, do what you think, talk to your counsel.

After your ruling of privilege, your order said send everybody a copy of your order, notify them to destroy and delete, and I did all of that.

Would you like to see that evidence?
THE COURT: Show it to Mr. Rose first.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Did you get copies of that? Just the first page there.

THE COURT: He can look at the whole thing.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
MR. ROSE: I've seen copies of certain of these, but not all of them.

MR. BERNSTEIN: What does it say?
MR. ROSE: Here.
MR. BERNSTEIN: What does it say?
THE COURT: No, you're on the stand. You can't ask him questions.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Not yet? I can call him in a minute?

THE COURT: Right. Go back.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Do you have -- do you want t \(\phi\) see it?

THE COURT: Hand it to my bailiff.
MR. BERNSTEIN: It's two letters, Your Honor.
The first one is after your order. The first one was long before your order just because I did the right thing, according to what I thought was right.

THE COURT: Keep on going.
MR. BERNSTEIN: So I did notify everybody. That's misstated in his petition. He's known about that. He has copies of that. He's on the distribution list.

I have submitted those to the Court as
evidence that --
Do you have that, honey, that proof that -THE COURT: Keep on going. Keep on testifying.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. If you look in your docket, I submitted those letters to the Court as proof, but yet Mr. Rose continues to try to set this up that I didn't comply, that I did something wrong. At the very bottom of it, you'll see that I put in the note to everyone, I don't know what to do pending appeal, check with your lawyer. That's all I said. But I had already told everybody to delete and destroy according to the Judge's order, which is attached herein, which I attached therein.

I have similarly posted some things around social media, but I don't know what effect that had. I don't know who read what and passed it to who. I'm so linked to this world in the Internet, it's hard to imagine it isn't everywhere.

Okay. Do you want more time?
THE COURT: Whatever you want to tell me.
MR. BERNSTEIN: You're listening or reading?
THE COURT: Both.
MR. BERNSTEIN: What was the second thing you wanted to know?
letter of the law.
If you want to rechange it and tell me I can't speak of it -- Mr. Rose doesn't even want me to speak; that even though my brother went on the stand and said he had a strategy, they conspired of force and aggression against me, to harass me.

THE COURT: Stop. Let me read this.
Okay, go on. Anything else on this issue without repeating yourself?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Was there anything else you wanted me to address?

THE COURT: On this -- so let's go to the deposition.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, the deposition. Your order, again, states clearly that Eliot should do a deposition before his next hearings.

THE COURT: So when are your next hearings?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Well, it was just scheduled last week.

THE COURT: For when?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Mr. Rose --
For September 24th.
THE COURT: Is that accurate?
MR. ROSE: Yes.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. So --

THE COURT: No, I --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, I didn't forward the e-mail to anybody. Your order says don't forward the e-mail. I didn't forward the e-mail. I didn't publish the e-mail anywhere. I didn't republish it inside any documents.

I did do what your order has nothing to do with, which was tell people there are links that has this information on the worldwide web. There was nothing we could do about the fact that before there was a privileged claim, it had already got to reporters and others. And you know, the reporter obviously is refusing. So your order says nothing about even republishing it, to be quite honest.

But I didn't republish it. I pointed people to blogs that contain lots of information, including that one. I have no control over those.

THE COURT: What about you putting, though, information about this letter in these lawsuits you filed?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I didn't. I just put a link. THE COURT: Well, okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, your order says don't forward the e-mail to anybody. I didn't forward an e-mail to anybody. I followed your order to the

THE COURT: All right. Slow down. So -MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: So here's what we're doing: When do you want to take his deposition?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, could I ask a question?

THE COURT: No. Let me first get that.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Does it have to do with that issue?

MR. BERNSTEIN: It does.
MR. ROSE: We have --
MR. BERNSTEIN: No, let him go on.
MR. ROSE: We have other hearings this Thursday. I could take it after those hearings.

THE COURT: This Thursday, I saw in the calendar there is something for this Thursday, but I'm not sure. It looks like it's a petition for discharge?

MR. ROSE: Of Ben Brown.
THE COURT: Of Ben Brown, okay. I didn't get that detail on there.

Okay. So that's not one of the hearings that's referred to in the June 19th order?

MR. ROSE: Correct.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline & 53 \\
\hline 1 & right up to that point, the day before or so \\
\hline 2 & because that's appropriate. \\
\hline 3 & THE COURT: Well, the only problem with that \\
\hline 4 & is if you get it the day before and they want to be \\
\hline 5 & able to use your deposition at the hearing -- \\
\hline 6 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, two days before? \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: -- expedite it, it's a real \\
\hline 8 & expensive procedure. \\
\hline 9 & MR. BERNSTEIN: They did that with Don Tescher \\
\hline 10 & (phonetic) and wasted all our money. \\
\hline 11 & THE COURT: Well, I'm just -- \\
\hline 12 & MR. BERNSTEIN: So I'm just saying I have a \\
\hline 13 & medical reason to do it this way. \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Can you take it two days before? \\
\hline 15 & MR. BERNSTEIN: Otherwise, they're putting me \\
\hline 16 & on all the narcotics -- \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: Is that better for you? Hold on. \\
\hline 18 & Let's look at your schedule. That's a Monday \\
\hline 19 & because the hearing is on a Wednesday. \\
\hline 20 & MR. ROSE: I'll take it Monday, and I'll \\
\hline 21 & decide -- we start early Monday and do it -- \\
\hline 22 & THE COURT: Let's do this right now. Pick the \\
\hline 23 & time and the place. \\
\hline 24 & MR. ROSE: 9:00 a.m. We had to pick the court \\
\hline 25 & reporter that was somewhere in Boca Raton, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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central --
THE COURT: Pick it now. Do you want to do it at the court reporter's office?

MR. ROSE: We noticed it at the court reporter that is behind One Boca Place on Glades, somewhere near between Glades and Military.

THE COURT: Do you know where he's talking about?

MR. BERNSTEIN: My wife probably knows.
THE COURT: Do you know where he's talking about?

MS. BERNSTEIN: Yes, but can we not make it
9:00? Can we make it closer to 10:30, 11:00
because we have kids at school that start at 9:00.
THE COURT: Well, I want him to finish. I don't want it to get postponed.

MR. ROSE: I would do it in this building if we --

THE COURT: I don't think we do -- we used to, but they don't do that anymore.

MS. BERNSTEIN: Where was the location again?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Call us with the location. We're pretty amenable.

THE COURT: This is going to go in the form of an order, that's why.

So the 22nd. Start at 10:00, Mr. Rose -MR. ROSE: Okay.
THE COURT: -- at the court reporter's office.
Have someone from your office, Mr. Rose, now get the name of that reporter because I want it in the order, and I'm going to serve it on both you and Mr. Bernstein.

MR. ROSE: Okay.
THE COURT: And that will be your deposition.
And that deposition will concern the pending matters that are being set for the 24th.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Only, correct?
THE COURT: You have tons of matters. So the way it works is that's the scope of the order. Mr. Bernstein, if you want to make an objection, okay, you don't stop the deposition; that's the rule. You make an objection for record, and then I rule on the objection if they want to use the deposition at a hearing. But there is no such thing as canceling, walking out --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Protective order, I believe.
THE COURT: But you --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Move for that? Okay.
THE COURT: You move for that, and then you continue the deposition.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Because here's the thing: You want these hearings set --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm fine with the deposition, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- you get deposed.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't know why we need on I'm going to be here for the hearing. So he could ask me the questions directly.

THE COURT: He wants to know in advance. So he can do that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: God bless him.
THE COURT: So that takes care of that issue here.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And is it limited in scope just so that I might not understand --

THE COURT: -- to the matters that --
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- to removing Ted?
THE COURT: Or any other pending motions that I'm hearing on the 24th.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Just the motion to remove Ted. MR. ROSE: We have three hours reserved. There are a number of other really important matters that we could hear if there's time. Can we set them for the same time, and if we don't have
time --
MR. BERNSTEIN: No.
MR. ROSE: -- and if we do have time, we can reach them?

THE COURT: Well, I don't know what those matters are. And the problem is that -- I can give you other hearing dates. If you want to have another hearing date on one of your motions, Mr. Rose, on Ted's side, I'll give you a hearing right away. And I'll give you a hearing on that.

MR. ROSE: I'm running into the same issues with the scheduling; they're not agree to schedule them. We had times available --

THE COURT: All right. So then if you tell me --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I need all that time.
THE COURT: When you want -- okay. So he has his hearing date on the 24th. If you want another date --

MR. ROSE: I'll schedule them separately.
THE COURT: No, this morning, when I'm in another hearing. But you'll sit outside and schedule. If you have a problem, you'll come back in.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can that be after my medical
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treatments? I've told him --
THE COURT: You could have the hearing, but you'll schedule it -- you'll talk to him about when you want it scheduled.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I've already told him after the 10th.

THE COURT: It can't be sometime way down the road.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I told him after the 10th, and you're not even available till then anyway according to Sherry.

THE COURT: So we'll work on that.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So now, we've got to move this a little bit. Let me go to the third issue, the e-mail.

Okay. Mr. Bernstein?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir?
THE COURT: Your list of respondents seem to be growing, okay? As the pleadings continue, they're getting longer and longer.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, Your Honor.
THE COURT: They're not?
MR. BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: I mean --

MR. BERNSTEIN: It's been like that since going back to time.

THE COURT: You have John and Jane Does 1 through 5,000.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Only if it ties into my federal RICO --

THE COURT: But this is my case.
MR. BERNSTEIN: But it might jump into anothe court.

THE COURT: And I saw recently, and I'm not sure where the pleading was, but if it gets brought to my attention that you put myself and Judge French down in the heading of the case, or in a sub heading of the case. You actually have us in the pleadings.

MR. BERNSTEIN: As material and fact witnesse possibly.

THE COURT: Yeah, but I mean, you can't just do things like that unless --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm filing a countercomplaint Your Honor. That's where it's at.

THE COURT: But you can't put a counter -- but you haven't filed one, and you're putting us --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I have filed one.
THE COURT: But judges' names are being put in
the heading of the case as a witness. Witnesses don't go in headings.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, I'll move it down then, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: All right. We're not -- we're judges. So we're trying to do this thing as dignified as possible.

I think I have an order prepared to sua sponte strike those paragraphs because you're not allowed to do that. That violates significant rules to do that. We're not witnesses --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well --
THE COURT: We're not witnesses to events that take place in the courtroom.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, these are --
THE COURT: No, no, I'm not going to argue with you on that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: So you need --
MR. BERNSTEIN: So move it down?
THE COURT: No. You need to eliminate us from the heading, and I'm striking I think it's paragraphs 53 and 54 of that -- whatever that lawsuit was that tries to say, as a pleading in the case, that you want Judge French and I to be
pleading, unfiled with the clerk, before me, and I determine whether it's going to be allowed to be filed with the clerk, and start the process under the rule as an adversary proceeding. That's one. That's Rule 5.025.

But I don't want -- I'm modifying the rule a little bit because I don't even want it served in clerk's office. The clerk is getting bombarded here unnecessarily.

I'm going to look at the lawsuit, okay? I'm going to see how it's styled, and then I'll determine whether it meets the rules for an adversary proceeding by the petitioner versus the respondent in the particular case that's filed. So I'll determine that. That's one.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Does that apply to the countercomplaint? I mean, I've been served --

THE COURT: Well, when --
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- and I have a time limit.
THE COURT: When you say you have, a countercomplaint, there's a complaint filed in what case?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Two cases, Oppenheimer and then Alan Rose sued me the other day in a -- and served me, and I had an answer a countercomplaint

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, but I'm not a lawyer.
THE COURT: But Mr. Bernstein, there is no way in any of these actions that 100 pages is a short pleading. So you need to be able to have that in mind. Understand you don't prove your case in your pleading; it's a notice pleading.

If you look at, for example, the Supreme Court forms, on a simple matter, which is there is an action in county court that the Supreme Court gives you the form on. If you loan someone \(\$ 100\) and they don't pay you back, here's what you write in the lawsuit. You write, "I loaned John \$100. He hasn't paid me back. I want a judgment for \$100."

You don't put, "I loaned John \$100. He's an SOB. He's using it for this."

Maybe all of that stuff is true and maybe you need to prove that at trial, but that's not how you plead it. The Supreme Court gives examples of lawsuits. They're all less than a page.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: So you may need more than a page, but you're going to pay attention to that rule.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I ask you a question?
THE COURT: Not yet. I'm finishing my order.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, no problem.
while I was not well.
THE COURT: The answer is yes. The answer is yes, I want to see it. I want to see it all.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I filed that --
THE COURT: I want to see it all.
Now, the other rule -- and you're writing this in the order, and so Mr. Bernstein gets it -everybody needs to remember that there is a rule, 5.020. So your wife is now taking that number.

Let me read you something about what that rule says. "When you plead something, the pleading, called the petition, shall contain a short and plain statement of the relief sought, short statement of the grounds, and short statement of the jurisdiction of the court." That's what goes in a pleading, okay?

Is there a word that I've been repeating in that last dialogue that should mean something to everybody? What do you think the operative word is?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Short.
THE COURT: Short. Short.
MR. BERNSTEIN: But there's a lot of crimes.
THE COURT: But it's designed to be a short pleading.

THE COURT: So we're going to go ahead now and modify all of the lawsuits to comply with this order, okay?

So now that will take care of the -- I've dealt with Item 2 and 3. Now let's go back to No. 1.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Hold on. I'm not done. I have to finish my ruling. I have to get rid of you folks.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm not sure exactly what that meant just now.

THE COURT: What?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Meaning I filed countercomplaints. I'm serving them. I've got --

THE COURT: Well, you filed them already. I'm not going to unfile them.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: I want to see all of the things that are pending. Don't file anything new in the way of lawsuits, petitions, counterpetitions, adversary proceedings without first bringing them in here unfiled for me to review.

If you file them, don't do anything else on them until you bring them before me so I can see what they are. And make sure -- because you're
harassment, it was frivolous --
THE COURT: It's a proper way of doing it.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, my question is this,
Your Honor.
THE COURT: What?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein, why is this happening in the Estate of Simon, meaning there was a privileged letter that my brother sent me some letter that wasn't a lawyer. You knew the whole story. Why is this in the Estate of Simon? Why has Alan Rose chose to file this --

THE COURT: This order I entered is in the Estate of Simon's case.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I know, but he has no right to be filing it in the Estate. But you already ordered a curator --

THE COURT: If I entered an order, if I entered an order in the case --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I know, but why are we hearing this here? Alan Rose is bringing things into the estate where we already have a curator and a PR now.

THE COURT: Right, but he's --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Why he is conducting this hearing --
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THE COURT: I understand that. He's conducting it because he -- "he," Mr. Rose -- is allowed to go forward on matters even though the PR, who I think is Mr. O'Connell -- and I forgot who we had for him -- hasn't done that. So these are --

I've looked at your motion. He wants to schedule your deposition. He has a right to be able to do that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Under this? Under Simon's Estate?

THE COURT: Wherever it's noticed. It was noticed --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, like the deposition was noticed in Shirley.

THE COURT: Hold on. No, I'm looking at it. The order entered was in Simon.

MR. BERNSTEIN: But you're ruling on things from Shirley's Estate, like production --

THE COURT: It says Ted's Bernstein's motion. I'm not going to revisit this. That's my order.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I ask you another question? You're talking about me having counsel and not being -- you know, how to file. These are estate actions brought against me as a beneficiary
who's already been injured by fraud, forgery --
THE COURT: Slow down.
MR. BERNSTEIN: My children have been harmed, et cetera. Money has been cut off. That's life support money to us.

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, what do you want to tell me?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm asking you, because it benefits the Estate, obviously they're bringing all these actions, and it's obvious I need counsel.

THE COURT: Get to the bottom line.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Can you approve that the Estate pay for my counsel?

THE COURT: If I can -- so here's the answer to that: How do I legally do that, is the answer. And if you've hired a lawyer or spoke to a lawyer, then why don't you ask the lawyer if it's legally allowed?

Remember, I can't give you a legal opinion. I have to --

MR. BERNSTEIN: It is legal --
THE COURT: Then have the lawyer file the --
MR. BERNSTEIN: I did file a motion with you
for legal fees, to compel them to pay legal fees.
THE COURT: Have your lawyer, have your
purported lawyer bring that matter before me.
MR. BERNSTEIN: He won't represent me until I pay him.

THE COURT: He can represent you on a matter to determine whether I'll have the estate pay for him or not. He has to come forward on that.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Wait, how do you say that? One more. No, I'm listening.

THE COURT: He can bring a matter before me to determine whether the Estate should pay for him.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And then you rule on that?
THE COURT: And then I'll rule on it, sure. There is nothing wrong with ruling on that. If it's legal --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it saves you a headach and me a headache.

THE COURT: You know what, we don't want headaches.

But we need these pleadings to be,
Mr. Bernstein, we need these pleadings to be contained a little bit better. We need to have a more sensible direction of the service list. We need to focus in on who it is that really is the focus of the action or the adversary proceeding.

And here's my final word on this, and you're
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\(1.08014: 7\)
1024:10
10:00 29:9,12,13
55:1
10:3054:13
10:4579:18
100 8:22 25:21
30:15 42:1 67:3
10th 58:6,9
11:0054:13
11:141:23
11:1579:17
151:21 8:1 24:10 35:22
15TH 1 : 1
16th 82:12
1815:8
18th 11:16 12:10
42:11 49:5,11
70:20 71:25
19th 13:7 16:2
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 48:24 50:5 & 600 3:5 \\
\hline 2 & 7 \\
\hline 2 20:13,16,19,21 & \\
\hline 21:13 41:11 68:5 & 8 \\
\hline 2,000 28:12 30:3 & \\
\hline 2.51614:6 & 9 \\
\hline 201:4 35:22 & 915:14 \\
\hline \(20081: 4\) & 9/13/12 1:8,9,11 \\
\hline 2012CP0043914:4 & 1:12 \\
\hline 2012CP4391 39:13 & 9:0053:24 54:13 \\
\hline 20141:21 15:8 & 54:14 \\
\hline 42:11 82:12 & 9:571:23 \\
\hline 20th 3:16 & 908:22 \\
\hline 22nd 55:1 & \(9212: 13\) \\
\hline \(23517: 25\) & 9A 71:5 \\
\hline 23619:8,15 & \\
\hline 23rd 29:2 & \\
\hline 24th 27:4,9 47:22 & \\
\hline 49:3 50:21,22 & \\
\hline 52:1,6 55:11 & \\
\hline 56:20 57:18 & \\
\hline 2753 3:10 & \\
\hline 28th 22:10 & \\
\hline 3 & \\
\hline 321:19,23 22:8,20 & \\
\hline 41:11 68:5 & \\
\hline \(3026: 9\) & \\
\hline 3315:16 6:2 & \\
\hline 334013:5,17 & \\
\hline 33434 3:11 & \\
\hline \(334441: 22\) & \\
\hline 34th 3:10 & \\
\hline 4 & \\
\hline 423:2 & \\
\hline 4,00028:19 & \\
\hline 4th 20:22 21:6,9 & \\
\hline 5 & \\
\hline 5 23:5 & \\
\hline 5,00012:13 59:4 & \\
\hline 5.02066:9 & \\
\hline 5.025 65:5 & \\
\hline 50,000 63:2 & \\
\hline 5053 : 4 & \\
\hline 5153:16 & \\
\hline 53 60:23 & \\
\hline 53814 : 25 & \\
\hline 54 60:23 & \\
\hline 561.245.8588 3:11 & \\
\hline 561.655.2250 3:6 & \\
\hline 561.832.5900 3:17 & \\
\hline 5s 64:13 & \\
\hline 6 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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THE COURT: All right. We're back on the Bernstein Shirley trust case. Time is of the essence. I carved out a time for you folks, so who are you going to call as your first witness?

MR. ROSE: John Poletto, P-O-L-E-T-T-O. He's coming down the hall now.

Mr. Poletto, you'll be on the stand.
THE COURT: Have a seat, please. Raise your right hand.

Thereupon,
(JOHN POLETTO)
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. ROSE: If I may approach, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yes.

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Would you state your name for the record, sir?
A. John Poletto.
Q. And what's your occupation?
A. I am the co-owner of Nestler Poletto

Sotheby's International Realty as a real estate broker.
Q. I have attached -- Exhibit 1 is a page from your Web site that says, "About John Poletto." Is that an accurate page from your Web site that describes some of your professional background?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROSE: I move Exhibit 1 into evidence.
THE COURT: Any objection? It's his CV.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: Okay. Number 1.
(Exhibit No. 1 was marked for identification
and admitted in evidence.)
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Is your firm the listing agent for the house at 7020 Lions Head Lane owned by the Shirley Bernstein Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. How long has that house been on the market?
A. One thousand one hundred fifty days.
Q. How does that compare to other listings in your firm?
A. It is one of the longest on record in the last five years.
Q. And the house was initially listed by whom?
A. Initially listed by our company, myself.
Q. Who owned the house or who was the --
A. Si Bernstein.
Q. Do you recall when that was listed?
A. Original listing date was January 24, 2012.

MR. ROSE: For the record, Mr. Bernstein died
in September of 2012 .
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. What did you think of the price when it was listed?
A. It was extremely high.
Q. Can you tell the Court why it was listed that high?
A. Mr. Bernstein had another residence on the ocean, and he was spending time between both residences and wasn't motivated at that moment to sell.

THE COURT: What was the listing amount?
THE WITNESS: On the other property?
THE COURT: On this property.
THE WITNESS: On this property, three million
four-fifty.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did you provide an affidavit at my request?
A. I did.
Q. Before you signed it, did you read it and edit it?
A. I did.

MR. ROSE: Exhibit 2, Your Honor, is the Affidavit of John Poletto. I would move that into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection to his affidavit?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. Well, I haven't
had any time to review any of this stuff.
THE COURT: We had this hearing on an expedited basis. That's not a legal basis not to admit it. Okay. Number 2.
(Exhibit No. 2 was marked for identification and admitted into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Is there a pending contract on the house?
A. Yes.
Q. How much is -- what's the price of the pending contract?
A. 1.1 million.
Q. Is it your belief that -- a recommendation that that offer should be accepted by the trustee?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that offer represent, in your opinion, the current fair market value of the property?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell the Court if you have any -well, specific experience in the St. Andrews community where this particular house is located?
A. I started with the developer in 1983, and -with new sales in the community. 1989 my partner, Mark Nestler, and I established our realty company called Nestler Poletto Realty. We have since 1983, on the new sales and resale side, sold over 750 new and resale homes within the community.
Q. Where do you currently live?
A. In St. Andrews Country Club for the last 25 years.
Q. Does your firm have a number of other houses currently listed in the St. Andrews community?
A. Yes. Currently about 12.
Q. Okay. Was the asking price lowered at some point from what Simon Bernstein had initially told you to sell the house for?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you briefly tell the Court the short history of that?
A. The short history, started with a number that Si Bernstein knew, at the outset, was completely a start number. We went from -- over the course of time
down into about -- we broke the two million range in July of 2013. We went to one million nine ninety-five, taking it down consistently based upon showings. We had traffic and showings, but were simply not getting offers.
Q. Did you have the house -- did you suggest that the house be appraised?
A. In all -- same situations, I recommended it to all clients.
Q. Was the house, in fact, appraised?
A. Yes.

MR. ROSE: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: You may.
MR. ROSE: I just need to give Mr. Bernstein his copies.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, we've never seen this.

THE COURT: Well, he's showing it to you.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: It's the first time we're getting this stuff, okay, just on the record --

MR. ROSE: This is 3 and this is 4.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- and we're beneficiaries.
(Exhibit No. 3 was marked for
identification.)
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. I'm going to hand you what's marked as Exhibit 3. Is this a contract between a buyer, whose name has been redacted, and the Shirley Bernstein Trust?
A. Yes.
Q. For \(\$ 1.1\) million?
A. That's correct.
Q. Look at -- paragraph 4 on the first page says that the closing was to be on April 20, 2015 --

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. -- or before.

Did circumstances arise after this was signed that necessitated an earlier or more immediate closing?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you just tell the Court briefly?
A. As of April 1st of this year the membership is going to increase \(\$ 30,000\). Current membership is \(\$ 95,000\). It will be going to \(\$ 125,000\).
Q. When the house was appraised, were you given a copy of the appraisal?
A. I was not.

MR. ROSE: I would move the appraisal in as Exhibit 4.

THE COURT: Any objection to the appraisal? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: Number 4.
(Exhibit No. 4 was marked for identification and admitted into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. I'm going to show you an appraisal that was done in July of 2014, and I believe comes out as an indicated value in the range of one million two or one million two fifty?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that consistent with your memory?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, based upon recent comps in the neighborhood, do you have a belief whether \(\$ 1.1\) million is a reasonable price for this house?
A. I'll give these to you so you can have them for the record. A property that was originally listed that we had listed for over \(\$ 3\) million, and was reduced over the course of time over the course of one year, 320 days, list price of one million eight ninety-nine at 7876 square feet of living space, that property sold for 1.3 million, and just closed as of March 11th and
is the most recent sale, and that sold for \(\$ 165 \mathrm{a}\) square foot. This home, it was updated and in really exceptional condition. That is one comparable sale. A second comparable sale on 7106 Ayrshire Lane, which by the way, this property also is at 7154 Ayrshire Lane. The second property at the 7106 Ayrshire Lane was listed originally at one nine seven five is

7,594 square feet of living space -- both of these homes are substantially larger than the subject house -- on the market for a fourth time, but sold for one million three seventy, and that was almost 7600 square feet. That cost per square foot was \(\$ 180\) a square foot. The proposed number we have is \(\$ 177 \mathrm{a}\) square foot. These are the two most recent sales that are within the last six months.
Q. How many times have you shown this, the Bernstein house?
A. Over 75 times over the time period.
Q. How would you describe the layout? Is it a layout that is attractive to most buyers?
A. Si Bernstein bought this house on a builder foreclosure, and the reason was this particular builder had three homes that did not hit the marketplace as to what properties -- what buyers were buying in St. Andrews. Mr. Si, actually, and his wife purchased
the home and customized the homes themselves. It doesn't have a floor plan that is consistent with the buyers for \(S t\). Andrews.
Q. And what's the condition of the house currently?
A. Well, the biggest factor is it's all Spanish; Spanish driveway tiles, interior Spanish tile floors, interior -- or exterior patio all terra cotta tile. Most people would tear all of that out.
Q. Can you tell the Court how much you would expect the new buyer to spend on the house in renovations?
A. In excess of 600,000 .
Q. Have there been any prior written offers in excess of \(\$ 1,000,000\) ? Written offers.
A. No.
Q. Have there been any prior oral offers in excess of \(\$ 1,000,000\) ?
A. Four months ago we received an oral offer of approximately 1.1 million.
Q. What happened to that offer?
A. The buyer was able to get his builder into the property and determine the home needed too much work for them to consider it seriously, so it never went to a written contract offer.
Q. Have the dealings with this particular buyer been arm's length and conducted in good faith?
A. Yes.
Q. Did they initially have a lower offer and it was negotiated to being higher?
A. Correct. Well, let me counter that. Their initial conversation with me was a number in the nine to nine fifty range, and \(I\) simply said that, in my opinion, that that would not even receive a response.
Q. And then they made an offer, there was a counteroffer. That's in your Affidavit. The 1.1 was indicated as their best and final offer?
A. And we -- on behalf of the Bernstein estate, we countered the \(\$ 1.1\) million offer unfurnished, as is. It was countered at one million one fifty. The buyer rejected that counter.
Q. Do you agree with the statement that although there's an appraisal, the best evidence of the market value of the property would be putting it on the market for an extended period of time and showing it to a number of buyers?
A. Yes.
Q. In your opinion, this offer is -Strike that.

Is this a fire sale price?
A. By no means.
Q. And, in your opinion, you would recommend that the Court approve the transaction as structured?
A. In my opinion.

MR. ROSE: Nothing further. Thank you, sir.
THE COURT: Cross.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, do I get an opening statement in this hearing?

THE COURT: No.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't think I need to get cross of him if \(I\) can get my statement out.

THE COURT: No. Because opening statements are not evidence, so I'm going to let you testify.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Put in evidence and stuff?

THE COURT: Yeah. Now is the time for cross-examination.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I reserve that?
THE COURT: Reserve what?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The time to cross-examine.

THE COURT: Yeah. Sure, you can. I'll let you do that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not sure I need anything from him.

THE COURT: Okay. He's reserving on cross. Keep him here just to see if we need him.

Any other witnesses?
MR. ROSE: The only other witness I would call would be Ted Bernstein.

Just as a proffer, all he would say is that there's a contract, he signed it, and he wants to close, and he followed the advice of the professional realtors he hired.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not accepting a proffer. Put him on or not.

MR. ROSE: I'll put Ted on the stand.
THE COURT: Stay here.
Thereupon,
(TED BERNSTEIN)
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did you receive the offer that's embodied in the contract that's marked as Exhibit 3?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And is it your opinion that that is in the best interest of the trust and the beneficiaries of the

\section*{trust?}
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Have you followed the advice and counsel of the professional realtors that you hired and you just heard testify?
A. Yes.
Q. And what's the carrying cost of the house if it's not sold under this contract, approximately, per month?
A. Six, \$7,000 per month.

MR. ROSE: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Any questions?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah. Can I examine
him?
THE COURT: Yeah. That's what
cross-examination means.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. Can I submit
some things into evidence?
THE COURT: Give them to Marias and he'll --
it's not in evidence. You have to show it to him first.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Who, Ted?
THE COURT: Yes, if that's what you want to do with them. Go ahead.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Do I have to mark it in
evidence?
THE COURT: Let's wait. Give him a document, ask him what you want. If you want to move it in, I'll consider it.

CROSS (TED BERNSTEIN)
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Ted, are you familiar with that report that's a Palm Beach County sheriff's report?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy.
THE COURT: I don't know what it says. Do you have an extra copy for me?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't have a lot of time to prepare three copies for today's hearing, but I've got two, one for you. They have 50 copies of this. We sent it in 20 pleadings.

MR. ROSE: This is dealing with issues about --

THE COURT: I want to see it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Oh. Show it to you?
THE COURT: So the question is: Is he familiar with this document purportedly authored by the sheriff's office? Is that the question?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: You can answer yes or no. Are you familiar with it?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I am familiar with it. THE COURT: Go ahead. Next question. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I use that? THE COURT: Yeah.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 5, the second paragraph? It's highlighted. It says the following, correct, "He said" -- that would be you, Ted -- or Spallina, your attorney who was --

Was Robert Spallina, Ted, your attorney as trustee and PR of the estate and trust of Shirley?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance. Beyond the scope.

THE COURT: Overruled. Overruled.
Was he?
THE WITNESS: Was he counsel for me for the Shirley Bernstein Trust?

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. And Shirley Bernstein when you were PR.
A. I'm not sure about PR. They were counsel for the Shirley Bernstein trust for a period.
Q. So the trust that's central to this piece of property; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So he, Spallina, said, though, that
"Against" --
THE COURT: Here's the thing. You don't know this, but you're reading from a document not in evidence --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I submit it?
THE COURT: -- and the author of it, of the document, is the sheriff's office, I assume is what you're telling me, and they are quoting someone who is not here, Mr. Spallina, so there's multiple evidentiary problems there.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I go to ones when Ted speaks to the sheriff?

THE COURT: Well, just ask him the question without referring to the document. Is this true? BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is it true that against -- that your counsel, Spallina, admitted that against his better judgment, he altered the first page of the first amendment to the Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement that you're trustee for; right?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: All relevant.
MR. ROSE: We are only here to decide whether the sale of this particular property makes sense.

THE COURT: Slow down.

So tell me, in a short form, Eliot, what the relevancy of this is.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What we're going to establish is that Ted has sold the property in the past against the advice of his counsel, then made distributions to improper parties against the advice of his counsel, that he didn't read the trust document he was operating under when he did that, that he signed tax forms that are going to be -- that are under investigation right now where he alleged he was personal representative of the estate. You'll remember the estate at the time he signed that was closed.

THE COURT: Remember, I said in short form give me the relevancy.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The relevance is -- is this sale going to cause a simmer -- similar group of allegations, or fraud; caused the sheriff's department to go investigate all of this; caused --

THE COURT: Well, you just told me that the allegations on this other property had to do with improper disbursements.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Improper sale, improper documents.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And we're going to show that he's making this sale under the same kind of things where no notice was given to beneficiaries, it's not following the statutes. So the question isn't what the property is worth --

THE COURT: I'm trying to do this in a separate fashion. I'm not deciding right at this moment whether to let the sale take place for any of the legal issues that you might want to raise. I'll hear about that in a second. What \(I\) want to decide now is there's a piece of property, it's owned by the trust. That, you said, was not in dispute. Ted is the trustee.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Alleged. We've got a hearing coming up on that three days after.

THE COURT: He is the trustee for purposes of that transaction, and the issue is whether the trust, regardless of who the trustee is, can sell this piece of property, pursuant to this contract for \(\$ 1.1\) million, and have the trust proceeds held in a way that I'm going to determine, not the way anyone else wants it to be. So the issue is: Is it appropriate to have the sale take place as opposed to holding onto the piece of real estate
that the realtors or Ted said cost six or \(\$ 7,000\) a month to do. Then I'll deal with the legal issues separately. This is a factual issue on whether it's good for the trust, putting everything else aside. I'm not deciding right now any of the other issues.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. So I'll be able --

THE COURT: You can ask him questions about the reasonableness of the sale for the amount in question --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. When you said --

THE COURT: -- which he doesn't, apparently, know anything about. He's listening to

Mr. Poletto.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. And I'm saying, for right now, \(I\) don't have a lot of questions as to -- I haven't had any of these documents to look at anything they have said. So the beneficiaries, if we didn't get a Zillow report, we would have never known this sale was happening, okay?

THE COURT: Well, we'll deal with that in a second.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Ted, did you notify the beneficiaries of that sale? Did you send out the documents when you started closing? Did you give any notice to any beneficiaries?

MR. ROSE: Objection.
THE COURT: It is definitely relevant so let me ask. You had this property listed; correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Did the beneficiaries know that the property was on the market?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And at some point you got a contract?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
THE COURT: Okay. And it looks like the contract was signed.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: See, I didn't even know that.

Let the record stand that \(I\) just got that.
THE COURT: You're interrupting me. Sit down now because you just violated a serious rule. Sit down. Sit down. I'm in the middle of questioning. I'll let you participate, but you're not going to be standing on top of me when you do
that.
Looks like the date of the contract is March 16, 2015. Does that sound right?

THE WITNESS: It does, Your Honor.
THE COURT: So when this contract was executed, did you provide notice to anyone of the fact that the property that you said you had noticed them was being listed, was now under contract?

THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor, I did. There are several other beneficiaries, obviously, so yes, I did. I know that Alan Rose has been in communication with Brian O'Connell, so, yes, the beneficiaries, many of the beneficiaries were aware of the sale of the property.

THE COURT: Well, did you do -- deal with the disseminate of the information about the contract or did you leave it to someone else to do that? THE WITNESS: I believe it was left to Alan Rose.

THE COURT: All right. So do you know whether Eliot Bernstein received notice?

THE WITNESS: I believe that he did through Mr. O'Connell. That's my belief.

THE COURT: So -- all right.

Next time -- Eliot Bernstein, the next time you laugh --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't laugh.

THE COURT: I heard you.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I coughed. I took a sip and coughed.

THE COURT: Well, you know what? Go outside and cough.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry. I did not laugh.

THE COURT: You know what? There was a while that you were behaving well.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I am.

THE COURT: You're getting worse now, because noise comes from you, gestures come from you, okay? Every time you do that two things happen. It's disruptive, just like it is now, okay, and it makes the presentation of your case worse. So if you have a desire to hurt yourself, continue to do this until eventually I stop you, okay? So I'm warning you, on the record, cut that out. No more disruptions. Speak only when I ask you to speak, and I'll always give you time to do it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: No noise, no raising and flailing
your hands. No one else does that, only you. Cut it out. Understood?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I will, yes, sir.
THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.
So I want to get to the heart of this.
Miss Foglietta, you're here for?
MS. FOGLIETTA: Mr. O'Connell.
THE COURT: Did you have notice of this sale
from Ted Bernstein?
MS. FOGLIETTA: No. The first notice I received was from Eliot and then I called Mr. Rose, who then told me he was just about to file a motion, and call my office and advise us of it.

THE COURT: When was that?
MS. FOGLIETTA: Monday afternoon.
THE COURT: Today is the 26 th, so Monday was the 23 rd .

Mr. Rose, tell me and show me the notices that you gave of this contract being executed on the 16th by Ted. Tell me and then show me. I mean, put aside tell me. Show me, because Ted says he didn't do it, he allowed you to do it. Show me the notices that you gave. I don't want -- there's no words here. Hand them to me.

MR. ROSE: It's the motion we filed.

THE COURT: Okay. The motion. The first time notice of this contract went to the beneficiaries or the \(P R\) was when you filed the motion?

MR. ROSE: Correct.
THE COURT: When was that?

MR. ROSE: To correct Your Honor, though, Ted signed it on the 18th, not the 16 th.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: That was a Wednesday. I was out of town. The buyers had seven days to do an inspection and cancel the contract. As soon as I got back to the office Monday, we prepared a motion to approve and we sent it to everybody. THE COURT: Did you send it to the PR's office?

MR. ROSE: I did.

THE COURT: Well, you just heard that they said they didn't know about it until Eliot told them.

MR. ROSE: The sequence of the events is Ted signed the contract, it looks like, on the 18th. The buyers were doing their inspections. The realtors changed the listing from listed to a
contingent contract. Eliot found out about it. He actually e-mailed out a notice of lis pendens on Saturday morning. So he had learned that. I returned from my trip on Sunday night. I prepared a motion for -- to approve it. I needed an affidavit from Mr. Poletto, which I had sent him Sunday, to wait for. When I got his affidavit back, I filed our motion. In the mean time, Miss Foglietta called me and I confirmed the sale, made arrangements to get the personal property inspected and all of that.

THE COURT: All right. Have a seat.
I got that. Okay. I got it.
Because we can't go on too long on this, do you have any other questions about Ted dealing with his -- the testimony he's given so far?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Does that include Alan?
THE COURT: No. Answer my questions. You can't ask Alan anything. Any other cross-examination of Ted?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. I need to know what beneficiaries you told that there was this sale.

THE COURT: He just said he left it up to his
lawyer. He did say that.
Have a seat. He's done for now.
MR. ROSE: Nothing further.
THE COURT: Miss Foglietta, do you have any position on the appropriateness or reasonableness of the sale?

MS. FOGLIETTA: No. My only concern is the personal property, to make sure that's not in the contract or any fixtures.

THE COURT: We'll deal with that if we have to.

So, Eliot, I'm going to let you testify, if you want. I'm going to break this down. Initially, it goes just to the issue Mr. Poletto spoke about, some aspect of whether it's reasonable to have this sale done at the 1.1 million price and close on the 31st.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, since I didn't get any of the documents, and can't review any of this, and see what -- if there was 75 people, how many made offers, even dummy offers, whatever, low balls, would validate any of this.

So this is all being thrown on me. I didn't even have the contract until today, okay? So I haven't had any of these documents until today. I had no chance to cross-examine or get a deposition from Mr. Poletto. These are issues that would concern --

He had -- when my dad died he had listed property with Mr . Poletto at \(\$ 5.5\) million on these two properties. We're about to sell both of them for two million, as if the market blew apart, went screaming down in that time. In fact, it went the opposite way.

So there's Zillow listings, which is just basic Zillow online, where the property's at two four with a \(\$ 170,000\) increase in the last few days, 90 days or something.

THE COURT: Why didn't you show that to Mr. Poletto when he was on the stand?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm reserving my right, if we have to get there. I want to get to the legal sufficiency, if this sale is following proper procedure, because that's what you're always interested in, statutes and all those codes and stuff.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So the question is: Were beneficiaries given time? Did I get a chance to throw out that I might want to buy the house with my father or anything, if I had time to look at all the documents, get a second opinion? No. Has there been adequate disclosure of this sale? And let me tell you. Alan Rose is wrong. We got alerted by Zillow that the property was being pending a sale (sic). We called the -- Joi and spoke with her and said --

THE COURT: All right. Stop for a second.
I have a question now, looking at this, to Mr. Poletto. Mr. Poletto, come on up because there's something I need to ask you on the record.

It looks like the contract -- the closing is to be on April 20 th or before; correct?

MR. POLETTO: That was the initial contract offer. The contract that was finally accepted, the closing date is on or before the 31st of this month.

THE COURT: So this isn't the contract?
MR. POLETTO: That's not the final contract.
THE COURT: I have two of them. The Exhibit 3 says April 20th.

MR. ROSE: There's actually an addendum in
there, I believe.
MR. POLETTO: The addendum takes it to the 31st of March. The reason being for that, Judge, is because St. Andrews Country Club, the issue was in order to close and take advantage -THE COURT: I'm looking at the exhibit to see if \(I\) see that in here.

MR. POLETTO: It's in the addendum.
MR. ROSE: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: I have it here. It's attached.
MR. ROSE: It's on paragraph 20. I can show it to Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me read it.
MR. ROSE: The actual --
THE COURT: I'm reading the Addendum. Okay. Well, the Addendum that was signed on the 18 th says that the "Buyer agrees to make full and complete application for golf membership including payment of \(\$ 95,000\) for it." And it's contingent upon -- "The contract is contingent upon buyer being able to be approved for a golf membership." So has he made the application? MR. POLETTO: Yes. THE COURT: Is he approved?

MR. POLETTO: He is in the process right now
of being approved, yes. There's no reason that he would not be approved.

THE COURT: All right. So in the contract itself, which date is also the 18th, it says that "Buyer wants to take advantage of the country club equity incentive and must close by 3/31/15."

MR. POLETTO: Correct.
THE COURT: So is the price increasing from 95 to 125 , or is it 125 , but there's an incentive to have -- if someone closes by the end of March, they will reduce it to 95?

MR. POLETTO: It's increasing as of April 1st by \(\$ 30,000\).

THE COURT: So if I don't let this close on the 31st because of the objections made to the rush aspect of this, what happens to this contract?

MR. POLETTO: It will cost \(\$ 30,000\) more and the buyer has the right to cancel.

THE COURT: All right. Too bad. Motion is denied.

Your notice is vastly inadequate, okay, and I'm concerned that, for the record, that even the PR really didn't know, and there's other things that the PR didn't know that I have to sift out
about this transaction. It may be reasonable, okay, the price, but because of what goes on in this case, there needs to be notice.

And Eliot raised a good point. You know, if he hears that there's a buyer for 1.1 million, he then, or anyone else, can make an offer to match that, not that he's going to do that, but they are entitled to notice. And the problem here, Mr. Rose, is I don't see how I can eliminate notice here, and the notice is just inadequate. It doesn't -- they are getting their copies of the contracts today. That's when they just said they got it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We don't have the right one.

THE COURT: It's, apparently, the right one because it refers to the -- to that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: So, you know -- I mean, there's a due process aspect of getting -- in a contested case like this, where people want to look and see, in dealing with the history of not you, but your predecessors admitted to improper dealings with things, they want to be able to look in and they're -- you know, Eliot is going to demand
every page be analyzed and every leaf be overturned because when Spallina and Tescher were involved with this, a lot of bad things clearly happened. Now, could that all wind up going nowhere beyond Spallina and Tescher? The answer is yes. You know, is there any other wrongdoing? I haven't found it yet. I keep hearing about it, but I haven't found it yet.

But this stuff has to be flushed out, and so these buyers are going to have to -- I mean, I can't rush this through in this count to try to save the buyers -- the buyers -- \$30,000. Okay. If you think that it's going to kill the deal, kill the deal or, Mr. Poletto, take it out of your commission, okay, if you want. So if I hear that, okay, that doesn't even cure it because they want notice, meaning you can tell them that you will, not the trust, but you will pay that \(\$ 30,000\). I'm not telling you to do this, but I know what realtors do to make deals go through. If they are going to back out, and after notice is given, you know, they are still willing to buy by the 20th, because April 20th is now the closing date, but for the rush part of this, so everyone is on notice that is now the target date of this, okay?

So everyone has to do their due diligence by that date, or then by that date I'll make a decision as to allow this to be sold or not. So far, what I heard, makes the price sound reasonable.

Eliot, when you say, but, Judge, why would the value of this home keep on going down when real estate is going up? The answer is, it is what it is, unless you show me otherwise. They have an appraisal that has an appraised value of this close to the amount that they are selling it, and the realtor explained appropriately about the conditions of the home, and it's been on the market for a long time, and so, you know, no one is buying this, and it's not a good idea to let a sale go that may not be able to be retrieved. Because I'm not worried about what happens with the consequences of this sale, in that, clearly, if it takes place, this money goes into escrow, that is the net proceeds to the trust, and cannot be used for any purpose, can't be used for fees, can't be used for costs. I mean --

MR. ROSE: I would a hundred percent agree with that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. So -- but, you know, both -- I mean Miss Foglietta even was
concerned about the rush job of this -- did I state that accurate -- being that the personal property --

MS. FOGLIETTA: The personal property, we haven't seen it.

THE COURT: So this has got to be flushed out, and for \(\$ 30,000\), you know, we can deal with that and have the closing by April 20 th.

MR. ROSE: Just for the record, just on the notice issue --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. ROSE: -- I mean the trust document does not require notice. The trustee is empowered to buy and sell real estate without notice to anybody. We fully intended to make disclosure, and we did it. The dates here -- I mean, I realize Your Honor is saying it's a short notice, but the contract was signed. It wasn't even final or binding until they did their inspection, but we did get the notice out on Monday. The Affidavit of Mr. Poletto was attached on Monday.

THE COURT: I'm not faulting -- it became a rush because -- this would not be happening, everyone concedes, but for what's going on at the country club in the raise of the \(\$ 30,000\). You
say -- your client's agreeing to that.
MR. ROSE: I wasn't saying no.
THE COURT: Your client is saying yes to that.

MR. ROSE: It was also part of the inspection, that the buyers had the right to cancel, so they said we'll take it as is with no -- you don't have to do anything, or give us any money for anything that is broken or needs fixed.

THE COURT: Don't change that. But if it's just a question between the April 20 th date and March 31st of the 30,000 , you folks can think of something creative to keep this deal alive.

MR. ROSE: I don't think it would be fair --
THE COURT: I'm not making him --

MR. ROSE: Al's total commission I think would be \(\$ 33,000\), and then he's going to pay 30 of it after he's marketed the property for --

THE COURT: Well, then, don't do that because that's not reasonable. I'm not suggesting that you do that. I wasn't even having in mind how much your commission was.

MR. ROSE: What would you like us to do with the buyers, advise them of what, we're going to
have another hearing to determine if the price is adequate? I think --

THE COURT: I don't have -- I mean -- okay. So I don't have any problem with the price, and I've heard no evidence -- and this was a chance for Eliot to present that, that there's a problem with the price. The problem is is that he's allowed to do other things, like review the contract, and something else that he may want to present, if he can, that makes it inappropriate to have the sale at the 1.1 million, okay? But I'm not -- I mean, there's nothing that I see that suggests it. Eliot may present a witness who says that the fair market value of this house should be much more than 1.1 million, but \(I\) would need hard core evidence of that. Not Eliot, he's not qualified to do it; not Zillow, not Houzz. They are not competent evidence to do that. You have to have a hard core person to do that. And I would weigh, then, that opinion, based upon the fact that now there's an actual buyer who is going to do an as-is cash contract. And so that's -you know, cash is king, okay, from my point of view. But \(I\) can tell you, if this deal goes down the tubes, it's over your objection, and if you
wind up at the hearing coming up, having nothing at all, then I'm going to take that into consideration. Nothing substantial. Not things that you say, Eliot, because you're in a zone that you share with, I don't know who, but it's not necessarily where I'm coming from. You know, you see a lot of things that are wrong here that are not necessarily legal wrongs, or wrongs that have been proven, and so I'm stopping this deal because you, Eliot, don't want it to go through, okay? It has all of the remnants of something that could be good for the trust. You don't want it. I'm not going to forget that. So you said: I want a chance to prove it's bad for the trust for various reasons. I'm going to hold you to that proof. True?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Perfect.
Your Honor, can I --
THE COURT: I'm in the middle of a trial.
What? Go.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You're talking to me in a trial?

THE COURT: No. Another trial. That's what all of these books are for.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I ask him one
question?
THE COURT: Go ahead.
CROSS (JOHN POLETTO)
BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Mr. Poletto, did you inform the potential buyer of potential litigations that could be -- that I've discussed with you about the property, and that Ted is trying to be removed, and if Ted is found to have acted fraudulently, that his removal herein, it could cause clawbacks, lawsuits; the cost of that could become --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'd like Your Honor to consider bonding for any possible damage because we have this rush and we're -- all of those things.

BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. But that's my question. You've known about litigation on this property for how long, since we talked, over a year?
A. (Nods).
Q. You've been given information.

THE COURT: You're talking and he's not even answering.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He's answering. He's shaking his head.

THE COURT: No. I'm not hearing anything. BY MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you answer?
A. Ask me the question.
Q. Okay. Did you inform the potential buyers of potential litigation you were knowledgeable about?
A. No.
Q. Was there a reason you didn't?
A. My job is to get the contract -- the property in contract. I'm not in a position to try to scare people away from buying a house we've been trying to sell for almost three years. The objective here is to sell the asset, not scare buyers away. So the answer is absolutely no. My job is to get it in contract and then you guys close it.
Q. So your profession doesn't require you to fully disclose potential litigation?
A. Let me ask a question. Is there litigation filed right now?
Q. Yes.
A. Was it prior to being filed?
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay. I haven't received a copy.
Q. I've given you information, we've had conversations about the litigation that's pending;

\section*{correct?}

MR. ROSE: I'd object.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Alan Rose --

MR. ROSE: I'd object.

THE COURT: Stop.
MR. ROSE: We're here to get you to order the sale approved. If you don't order the sale approved, it doesn't go forward.

THE COURT: The contract is still pending.
I'm not negating the contract. You want -- what you wanted was a court order to allow the closing to take place by the 31st.

MR. ROSE: And to prohibit him from interfering.

THE COURT: I'm going to deal with that -I'm going to deal with that second.

MR. ROSE: Because he --

THE COURT: You don't have to argue that, him interfering. I'm going to enter an order right now dealing with that subject.

MR. ROSE: As soon as you tell the buyers that there's going to be litigation to claw back the property, these are very wealthy people. They don't need the aggravation.

THE COURT: I don't need your help on this
issue.
MR. ROSE: I apologize.
THE COURT: So one part of my ruling is that, because Eliot is objecting and says there's a good faith basis for this sale not to go through whereby the -- what's going to happen is there's going to be a change in the asset structure of the trust from property to cash. Eliot is objecting to that.

All right. So, Eliot, I'm going to make this clear, I'm going to right it. If the buyers here, by telling me that the Pony Express told them that there was litigation about this, I know it's coming from you, okay? I am ordering you not to discuss, not to disseminate, or not to give any notice that you think needs to go to the buyers, okay? And if I find out that the buyers find out about the stuff that you just asked Mr. Poletto about, I'm only going to look to you, and then you and I are going to have issues, okay?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I hear it.
THE COURT: Because you may think it's good to do that huffing that you do to Mr. Poletto by telling him all of that stuff that you think has some merit, that \(I\) have never found to have any
merit yet, okay, so I haven't found the conspiracy, I haven't removed Ted, I haven't found that it matters who's trustee in order to go ahead and sell this for the benefit of the trust. I might wind up finding that all of the things you're doing is harmful to the trust and the trust beneficiaries, okay. I haven't gotten there yet because that's why I'm trying to push this matter through.

So we're going to take this one small step at a time, but I'm ordering an injunction against you not to contact the buyers directly or indirectly with respect to any information concerning this transaction. Understood?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes. I've never contacted any buyers.

THE COURT: But you're suggesting that they need to know that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm suggesting if he knew it.

THE COURT: But that's not the point.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. That's fine. I understood what you said.

THE COURT: That's not your job.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: My next question was:

Did you get a lis pendens \(I\) filed in this matter? THE COURT: Doesn't matter. I got it. They are told that it's filed.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So are the buyers aware there's a lis pendens? I'm not allowed to ask that?

THE COURT: No, you're not allowed to ask that. I don't know who you gave notice to. If you sent notice to the contract -- if you sent notice of this lis pendens to a contract buyer, you're going to be right back in court here so quickly your head is going to ring.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not going to talk to the contract buyer.

THE COURT: No, but I don't want you to send something to them.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not going to send anything to the buyer. I would never do that. I'm not doing that.

THE COURT: Because, obviously, if there's a sale --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm assuring you, I am assuring you on that.

THE COURT: -- because if we have a sale, the lis pendens is going to go away. They can't clear
title. It can't be sold over that.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Correct. Now, I don't think I filed it properly in the county and recorded it with the thing.

THE COURT: If you improperly file a lis pendens, you're at risk for whatever it is you did, so withdraw your lis pendens then, if that's the case.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not quite sure I filed it wrong. I'm pro se. We will have to get to that. But the point was, you asked that everything come to you in this case.

THE COURT: But you didn't do it with the lis pendens.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I did. I gave it to you in October.

THE COURT: Well, yeah, but I didn't approve it. I held it because I didn't order it being filed. You did send it.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: In the meantime, all of
a sudden, we get alerted there's a pending sale. That would have denied me the due process to file a lis pendens properly.

THE COURT: No, no. All you had to do was -he went ahead and gave notice because you can't
sell it without getting court approval, okay, and so once he filed to get court approval, you had notice, he gave you notice of the hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's just the other day.

THE COURT: That's when this all started.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, I filed the lis pendens first --

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: -- prior to his --
THE COURT: So what do you want, Ted?
MR. TED BERNSTEIN: I know you have something else pressing, but I'm concerned I don't understand something Mr. Poletto said and I want to make sure in court I'm clear.

THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. TED BERNSTEIN: Did you say that there's a chance the buyer backs out of this contract if it's not done by March 31st, just walks away from the deal?

MR. POLETTO: That's correct.
THE COURT: I didn't see that as a contingency.

MR. POLETTO: I actually have another document.

MR. ROSE: I haven't allowed my client to sign the addendum because the addendum is -- they had a chance to inspect or cancel. They exercised their right, and said we will accept it as is if it closes by March 31st. I have not let him sign that because we -- I mean, I don't know that we technically need court approval to sell property in trust, but in this case, we wanted your approval.

THE COURT: Right.
MR. ROSE: We were not going to do it otherwise, sir.

THE COURT: It's one and the same.
MR. ROSE: If we don't sign that, then there's no contract at all and the buyers are not bound by anything, and ultimately what's going to have to happen is we're going to have to lower the asking price by \(\$ 30,000\) to get these guys to go forward.

THE COURT: For right now, subject to me assessing the financial consequence of that to the person who caused that sale not to go through, I mean, that's what I reserve. But, Mr. Rose, part of the problem is, it's like when I tell people when they file emergency hearings, not everything
that seems to be important is an emergency. You may have an important reason, and I think you do, to try to sell this by the 31st. It may keep this deal alive, and it may save someone \(\$ 30,000\), but \(I\) can't use that as a basis to deny the beneficiaries the chance, now that we kind of agree that they have a right to be involved in this, to some degree, not contacting the buyers, so there's a trade-off here in that. And so, you know, if this was life or death, I would go for life, but it's not life or death. This is a piece of property. The property will just stay, if this buyer backs out. If the buyer backs out, I'll deal with that.

Ted, what else?
MR. TED BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, just to clarify for me, what things can the beneficiaries do to help bring whatever they want to bring to bear to make this happen faster so that we, at least, know what the expectations are?

THE COURT: That's a good question. The answer is, now that the beneficiaries have notice, okay, if they have an objection that's bona fide, that's based upon a -- for example, here's a potential bona fide basis. No matter what
testimony I've heard about the reasonableness of this, the property is really worth more, and if it was, that's something that you, Ted, would want to know, and so let's say --

MR. TED BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: -- I don't know who did that appraisal, but a bona fide appraiser said, for some reason -- this is James Hackett, okay -- and some other MAI appraiser said, no way, you know, Ted, this is a 1.4 or \(\$ 1.5\) million deal, you may want to know that.

MR. TED BERNSTEIN: Definitely.
THE COURT: So that's one thing, because I'm told that it's not like the history of the listings, as they have decreased and the appraisal has been shared -- this appraisal was done as July of 2014, so did anyone -- did the beneficiaries get this appraisal?

MR. ROSE: No, Your Honor. In fact, I would not -- I would like you, if you would, ore tenus, to expand your injunction to prohibit the filing in the public records of any of these exhibits, including the appraisal and --

THE COURT: I'm holding on to the exhibits. I'm not filing them.

MR. ROSE: He has a copy of them, though. He now has the appraisal. I would not have advised he be given a copy --

THE COURT: He can't -- Eliot can't file anything without sending it to me first.

MR. ROSE: But he puts it on the Internet, and we don't want the appraisal to be on the Internet.

THE COURT: I've already ordered him not to do anything directly or indirectly -- contact any aspect of this transaction -- with the buyer. That's direct or indirect.

MR. ROSE: We didn't share the appraisal because, frankly, we were concerned it would be public and that would defeat their chance of selling it.

THE COURT: I'm not -- look, nothing is easy here. It's not going to get easier until we can get hearings where I can start to knock off some of the issues, which is what \(I\) have been saying now like a broken record.

At some point, either Eliot is going to be sustained on his positions or he's going to be overruled, but one way or the other, we can put some of this stuff to rest. The problem is we're
doing all of this business with some of the metes of the case still up in the air where I haven't been able to adjudicate; the claims that Ted should be removed; the claims that there's wrongdoing beyond Spallina and Tescher, the trust is not valid. I mean, give me a chance to rule on that, because once I rule on that, then the matter is over with on those and you'll know one way or the other what to do.

Do you understand what I'm saying? I think we have hearing time coming up. Let's use that, you know, prioritize hearings on this case. So as soon as we can, I'll give it to you.

MR. ROSE: I appreciate that.
We have one other thing, three seconds.
Miss Foglietta would like to go forward with the inspection on Friday and I have no objection to it. It had to be done at any point and she already had it scheduled.

THE COURT: That's fine.
MR. ROSE: The only issue is, your prior order was that Eliot could be present outside of the house but not go physically into the house during the inspection. We'd just like to maintain that same ruling.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No. Your Honor, you just said in the last hearing -MS. FOGLIETTA: Your Honor, if I could -THE COURT: Hold on. It's her motion. MS. FOGLIETTA: If I could, I want to clarify a few things because we went so quickly through it, and I just want to bring to Your Honor's attention, if I may approach, an order that you prior entered on this, on Mr . Brown as curator, his motion, where you capped the price of the inspection at \(\$ 500\) for Mr . Hittel to do it and then you included language that Ted and Eliot could be there, but only could be outside.

So what my petition has, which is directly under that order I've just handed you, Judge, is we're actually asking for a few things, and I want to address something Mr. Rose brought up outside to me, too, that \(I\) just confirmed with Mr. O'Connell. We're asking for an appraisal, an inspection, and to take possession and move the property in the house. Now, when Mr. Hittel originally agreed to that \(\$ 500\), that was if things were not boxed in boxes in the house. We have since found out that there are. He had said previously, if things are boxed, now I need an
assistant and it's not going to cost \$500.
So what I am seeking is to have Hall and Hall, a different appraiser, actually do this, not Mr. Hittel, at a rate of \(\$ 125\) an hour, and also to get him an assistant at a rate of \(\$ 100\) an hour. So that's the first thing.

THE COURT: And the tasks these people will undertake is what? MS. FOGLIETTA: To inspect the property that's currently there because there's been allegations some of the property is missing; to do another appraisal because there's been allegations that the first appraisal was done incorrectly. THE COURT: Appraisal of the personalty? MS. FOGLIETTA: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Let me ask you something. This is being done this way in connection with the sale of the property?

MS. FOGLIETTA: Well, we had always planned on filing another motion because we found out Mr. Hittel couldn't do the appraisal -- or the inspection -- excuse me -- that you ordered for \$500 and now we've just, you know, kind of brought it to the forefront here because of the sale of the property. But, either way, it needs to get
done. It's always been something that's on our plate.

THE COURT: So inside this house is what that belongs to the estate?

MS. FOGLIETTA: Personal property of the decedents. Furniture -- I haven't seen it myself, but I believe it's furniture, things that are boxed, all sorts of trinkets and things, but the way that I understand it, it's boxed, tangible personal property, and also personal property that's just outside.

THE COURT: And none of that is being sold with the unit; is that true?

MR. POLETTO: Correct.
MS. FOGLIETTA: That's what \(I\) have been told. I haven't seen the contract.

THE COURT: So everything, then, other than things that are not to be detached, is going to leave there and go to the estate, is that the idea?

MS. FOGLIETTA: Yes.
MR. ROSE: It is. I would suggest, if there's not a closing, you don't empty the house.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand that.
MR. ROSE: There's two different issues.

They can do their inspection. I have no problem with that.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: And we understand there's an increased cost. I don't believe they should do another reappraisal.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that I need an appraisal now. If you want to, in anticipation that there's going to be a closing and that the items of personalty are going to leave there and go somewhere else, and where will be at the direction of the PR; you'll say where you want it -- you know, the idea of having an appraisal is something we can wait on because -- I mean, the items are in the house now and ultimately they will be taken out of the house.

MS. FOGLIETTA: The only reason we were asking that is because we have to have Hall and Hall already go to the house to do the inspection, and since he will already be there charging the same rate, we figured we might as well just have the appraisal all done at the same time rather than having him have to go back and us come back on another motion, you know, and go through that whole thing, so if we could just do it all at the
same time --

THE COURT: How much is this going to cost, though?

MS. FOGLIETTA: It depends how much is in the house. I don't know. It could take one day, it could, at the most, take two days. From what I've been told from Mr. Rose, there's not all that much there. I'm hoping it will be one day, but it's hard for me to say without actually having --

THE COURT: Well, one day and between the two people, that's \(\$ 250\) an hour, so eight hours, that now could be, you know --

MS. FOGLIETTA: And if he's got to go there, anyway, to do the inspection, he might as well do the appraisal.

THE COURT: The appraisal is included in that time frame.

MS. FOGLIETTA: That's right, Judge, yes, it's for both. That's the rate we were quoted for both. So I would ask that, you know, so that he doesn't have to go back and incur additional fees, so we don't have to file another motion, incur additional fees, that we could do the inspection, the appraisal, and then take possession and store --

THE COURT: Well, not possession, because it needs to sell with furniture in it. That makes it more --

MS. FOGLIETTA: We could hold off on that. That was only in anticipation of the sale, Judge, that portion of the motion.

THE COURT: Okay. So inspect and appraise. Approved to inspect, appraise, but not remove. MS. FOGLIETTA: And then the next thing, Judge, part of this motion was inspection of some office property, which we briefly spoke about yesterday. Mr. Rose said there's nothing there, but I just wanted to be clear that Your Honor still, you know, allows us to go ahead and inspect it and appraise that.

THE COURT: You're allowed to inspect the property under the rules, true? Yes.

MS. FOGLIETTA: And then Mr. Rose agreed yesterday that the trust would pay for, and Eliot had no objection, the inspection and appraisal of the home -- of the property in the St. Andrews home and we would ask for the same thing for the office stuff, although it seems like there might be nothing there. There may be no cost associated with it.

THE COURT: Well, if you have an assistant, if there's nothing in there, that cost could be minimized by someone verifying there's nothing in there.

MS. FOGLIETTA: That's correct, Judge.
THE COURT: That sounds like it's a quick thing.

MS. FOGLIETTA: And then two other things. The prior order that you have in front of you did limit Ted and Eliot from going in, and then Your Honor made -- whether it was a ruling or not, I don't know -- but you made a statement at yesterday's hearing that Eliot was allowed in and was allowed to video it, so I just wanted Your Honor to know there was a prior order that you entered and I wanted to make sure that the estate wasn't doing anything contrary to either your oral statement yesterday or written ruling prior.

THE COURT: Let me look and think about this. Okay. I'm going to reverse myself.

Eliot, you're not going in.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, can I explain why you made that decision?

THE COURT: I'm leaving everything in there. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: This is very important.

THE COURT: What? Go ahead.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The reason you made that decision yesterday is because Joi found out yesterday that -- not the only thing in the house is supposed to be my dad's house stuff, 4,000 square feet of furniture and possessions of my mother's condominium are also supposed to be in that house. You made a court order to inspect those items at that property. We just found out yesterday from Joi that there are claims that Mr. Rose has, or Ted, somebody has sold, or otherwise moved properties.

THE COURT: So what's there to inspect?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, to find out
what's missing from --
THE COURT: Here's the thing: The appraiser that goes in is going to not look at title, but look at items in the house. They will photograph and prepare a report of what's in there. They are not going to remove it. It is staying in there, so I'm not sure what you're getting at.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They are saying nothing is left.

THE COURT: Nothing left of what?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Of the personal
property.
THE COURT: Well, no, there is personal property.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Of Si, not of Shirley.
THE COURT: But, see, the appraiser is not determining title. He's going to determine what's in there and what it's worth.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, the Court was told one thing. He had no right to sell personal property, meaning that was in their custody.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not dealing with -- if something is sold, I'll deal with that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm a beneficiary. Why would you preclude me from the inspection?

THE COURT: Because I want to. I think you'll be disruptive.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I won't.
THE COURT: I'm ruling on that.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I promise you not to be disruptive in any way.

THE COURT: The answer is no. You can be present, you can stay outside, you can watch the appraiser go in. If he wants to speak to you, he can, but you can't make him. He's going to look at whatever is in there, he inventories, he
photos, he does all of that, and then it's available to be looked at at some point later on. And I don't want this being a show, and that's why I'm changing my mind.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here is the other part. If we're going to do this evaluation of the house, Mr. Poletto, in his statement says that -- in his affidavit or something says there's \(\$ 300,000\) of damages and remodeling costs and it's in -- well, I was with my dad a lot at his house before he died. The thing was immaculate, perfect, just had an elevator put in. I don't know the cost.

THE COURT: What's your point?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The house wasn't
crumbling apart like it's being portrayed. I want to know: Did they rip out the copper? Is the wall missing?

THE COURT: You have an inspector who did an appraisal and went in.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't looked at that yet.

THE COURT: He describes the condition and there's --

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If I'm going to get another inspector, or possibly a second opinion,

I'd sure like to go in.
THE COURT: Well, if -- not you. If you make a bona fide motion to have it inspected by a bona fide appraiser, I might let that person in. Maybe there won't even be an objection on their side. Because no one -- an appraiser is not going to move stuff around. They are going to look, take pictures. You know, that's the problem. They don't want you in there.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So they are going to -they are going to take pictures. Can Joi take video, possibly?

THE COURT: Well, I'm not telling them how to do their job.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So there will be photo evidence.

THE COURT: We'll see where it goes, but for what you want to accomplish, you need to do it through separate motions, if you think there is something in there, but why don't you wait and see what, at least, is reported about being in the house and make up your mind what you want to do. MS. FOGLIETTA: Judge, I'll use the same language from previous order. THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FOGLIETTA: And the very last thing, which shouldn't take long, is we need \(\$ 500\) from the trust to put up front as an initial deposit to get this thing rolling tomorrow so I would ask that as part --

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. ROSE: There's no objection. One clarification. I personally am not paying any of this. Under the statute that allows the personal representative to request money from a revocable trust, we've agreed, for this purpose only, we'll advance the costs. I'll give her a check for \(\$ 500\) today from our trust account.

THE COURT: Thanks. Bye.
MR. ROSE: Thank you for your time.
THE COURT: No problem. I need to get to my trial. Take this stuff back, please. I'm giving you the exhibits back, I'm not taking them.

MR. ROSE: I'll hold them.
THE COURT: Get me that order, make sure Eliot doesn't contact this buyer directly or indirectly.

MR. ROSE: When should we set another hearing?

THE COURT: We have a closing now set for

April 20th so, Eliot, you need to do your due diligence. If you're going to want something to be done, set it so \(I\) can hear it before the 20 th. So if you want to file something, get me what you want to file, don't file it, I'll look at it, I'll give you a hearing date before the 20 th, if it's bona fide. Otherwise, they are going to look forward to selling this on the 20 th.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I, right now, schedule this hearing to continue so I can deal with the legality of if this is a legal sale? I mean, we're going to have to deal -- I don't care. If the price is right -- look, Your Honor, if the price is right, I'm all for it, but if the deal is going to put it into a legal quagmire of fraud, possibly, and make decisions that lead us down that path, I think \(I\) have to have a hearing that continues this hearing to determine if the trustee is acting within the statutes. It's real simple. If he's not, then whether the price is good or not isn't the key, the key is the statutes aren't being followed. I don't want to have to bond people, but, you know, obviously if we're going to take a risk of violating statutes to get a sale done because there's a buyer who just popped out
of the woodwork today --
THE COURT: Okay. But I can't give you a hearing right now. I've got to start my trial. If you file something, I'll get you a hearing.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So a continuation of this hearing?

THE COURT: Or something new. They are still -- right now \(I\) know the sale is for April 20th. They are going to come in before then to get an order that actually allows them to close on that date.

MR. ROSE: Or I will advise you that they canceled. We'll keep you posted.

THE COURT: Or they have canceled. One of the two. Okay. Bye.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Thank you.
MS. FOGLIETTA: Judge, would you like me to write this up and send it to you?

THE COURT: Yeah. I don't have time to do that now. Thanks.
(The hearing was concluded at 2:10 p.m.)
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1
2
\[
\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{R}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{D}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{S}
\]

THE COURT: Good afternoon. You may be seated.

MR. ROSE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Good afternoon.
THE COURT: All right. We have the matter of Estate of Simon Bernstein before the court this afternoon.

The first motion that \(I\) had was a motion to stay distribution of estate assets pending satisfaction of all creditors claims. And then I see that there was also an amended notice of hearing for a multitude of different petitions.

So why don't we start out with having counsel enter their appearances and then we'll get going.

MR. O'CONNELL: Brian O'Connell, Your Honor. I'm the personal representative of the estate.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se.

MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey here on behalf of four adult grandchildren of the decedents, Molly Simon, Alexander Bernstein, Michael Bernstein and Eric Bernstein.

MR. ROSE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Alan Rose on behalf of Ted S. Bernstein as successor trustee of the Simon Bernstein Trust, which is the beneficiary of the estate.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROYER: Your Honor, I'm Jeff Royer. I am with Peter Feaman's office. We represent William Stansbury, who's an interested person and a substantial claimant of the estate of Simon Bernstein.

THE COURT: So you're actually the movant on the first motion I talked about then.

MR. ROYER: We are. Your Honor, I don't know that we noticed for today, but, yes, it's -- it is a motion that we filed.

THE COURT: Oh, that's the motion that \(I\) had for hearing.

So anyway, who wants to go first in terms of the pending motions because it would probably be helpful to have someone kind of give me an overview of who the players are.

MR. ROSE: Can I just raise one issue before we start the hearing?

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. ROSE: Just because it's -- I sent a

1 letter to the court advising you that Mr. Eliot 2 Bernstein and his relationship to the Proskauer 3 firm, which you were employed at one time.

THE COURT: Yeah, I got that letter. I reviewed it. Did you copy everybody else on the letter?

MR. ROSE: I did.
THE COURT: All right. The letter raised an issue of whether \(I\), as the judge, should consider disqualification of myself because of my prior employment with Proskauer Rose, which was approximately 15 years ago.

Once I received that letter, I looked into 14 the JEAC opinions regarding how far back the sponte disqualify myself from this matter. I really have no -- I haven't had contact with

21 Proskauer in any meaningful way in 15 years, 22 so...

MR. ROSE: I was only raising it so that judges normally go. And, normally, it's a one to two year period that you look back in terms of automatic recusal.

So based on that, I'm not going to sua so.. Mr. Eliot Bernstein was aware of that. And if he has any objection -- I don't have any objection.

1 I wanted to let -- make sure that he was aware of
2 that and would have an opportunity to --

THE COURT: I appreciate it.
MR. ROSE: -- object now if he wishes to.
THE COURT: Yeah. And I can -- if I can
find. I have it here, I'll let everyone know which opinion \(I\) was relying on when I looked at that.

Yeah, just to be more specific on the note that was sent to me -- what was the name of the corporate entity that they said was represented by Proskauer?

MR. ROSE: It was an entity called Iviewit, which engaged in a lengthy multi-year or decade-long battle with that law firm.

THE COURT: With Proskauer or Proskauer was representing one of the parties?

MR. ROSE: With Proskauer. Proskauer, I think, represented the -- Proskauer represented Simon Bernstein while he was alive and drafted some documents in 2000 that would have been superceded by 2008 documents. And Proskauer also represented the company that Eliot Bernstein started called Iviewit.

THE COURT: After 2000?

MR. ROSE: I think there was litigation -- it was during the '90s.

THE COURT: Because I left -- I left the firm in 2000, I believe, if my recollection is correct.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I think I know you
from there. Did you work at the one in Boca?
THE COURT: Yeah, I have no recollection of having represented Iviewit, though.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, actually, which department were you with?

THE COURT: Litigation.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I was right across the hall from your office, do you recall?

THE COURT: No.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: This is going back 15 years.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. And --
MR. ROSE: Just for the record, if I could finish. I wasn't suggesting that you did anything wrong. I was just bringing it to your attention. And, also, I do think, though, all the parties would appreciate it if Mr. Eliot Bernstein has an objection based upon your Proskauer relationship and his relationship to that firm, which is -that he would raise it if he wanted to, or

1 otherwise we're fine. Because I don't want to have a problem and get recusal motions coming down the road.

THE COURT: Yeah, and I never take those things personally. It prompted me to go to the Judicial Ethics Advisory Opinions and look at what the standard is. Because if there is a legal basis that \(I\) would need to disqualify myself, I would absolutely do it. But going back 15 years, based on the JEAC opinions, I didn't view there as being any legal requirement that the court would disqualify itself.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: There might be another issue. I think Proskauer is a counter-defendant in one of the estate counter complaints in this matter.

THE COURT: Is this matter before me?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Is that accurate?
MR. ROSE: Well --
MR. O'CONNELL: I'm not sure.
MR. ROSE: I don't want to be the spokesman for the whole world. But I think starting in the '90s Proskauer represented this company that Mr. Eliot Bernstein called Iviewit. And he claims

1 that Proskauer stole his patents worth billions or 2 trillions of dollars. And then there was

3 litigation that started in maybe 2000 or 2001 and 4 continued through State Court, New York Federal also sued most of the partners of the firm at the time.

THE COURT: Well, my --
MR. ROSE: Again, I'm just --
THE COURT: Well, I view the issue of
Proskauer attorneys being in front of me somewhat differently than the firm Proskauer being in front of me as a party. So if what I'm hearing is that it's not just a situation where Proskauer attorneys are in front of me, but Proskauer itself is a party to the action, then -- and that's an issue that Mr. Bernstein is raising -- then the court would probably view that slightly differently because in that situation because they are a party and \(I\) was a partner, even though it goes back 15 years -- I'd have to look at the JEAC opinions, there may be a legal basis at that point. And I don't know if you're sitting right

1 here now -- there may be a legal basis for me to disqualify myself if Proskauer is actually a party in this proceeding to where \(I\) would be asked to make rulings, you know, for or against them. So where -- they are a party in this -- because all I have in front of me right now is an estate proceeding.

MR. ROSE: Right. Well, there's five related -- five or six related cases. Judge Colin, I think after denying the second or third motion to disqualify, recused himself and the cases were just recently transferred. In one of the cases there is a counterclaim. It has been stayed because Mr. Bernstein is not allowed to file any papers without getting permission from the judge first.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Not only
Mr. Bernstein, you too.
THE COURT: All right. Sir, don't interrupt. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm sorry. MR. ROSE: The counterclaim is stayed. And I don't know if Proskauer is a party, but if Mr. Bernstein represents to the court that they're a party, then I would take it -THE COURT: You know, the standard for a

1 motion to recuse is -- the objective standard is a 2 party reasonably in fear that he may not receive a 3 fair trial. And even at 15 years is remote -- and 4 I think the cases say that. I'm somewhat

11 is at this point \(I\) would recuse myself, if raising the issue, then, you know, it's a remote issue, but, you know, it's something that -- it's in the eyes of the beholder to some extent. Are you in reasonable fear of not getting a fair hearing and trial on this matter?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not certain yet. That's kind of why I'm here today.

THE COURT: The thing is you have to move quickly because you have to -- you have to do it within 10 days of the date you become aware of the information. And what I told you today is that I was a -- you've probably already known it -- but I

1 was a former partner at Proskauer Rose.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, your bio is confusing on the Internet. Some have you there -THE COURT: Maybe I'll have to fix that. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: And then your -- well, you should fix the court one because it has no biography.

THE COURT: The court ones, they don't give that kind of -- it's not like private practice.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's one of the issues \(I\) want you to consider because, you know, it's going to take me time to consider all the factors here that I'm learning now. One of the issues is that the technologies that \(I\) invented that I allege that Proskauer stole --

THE COURT: Here's the thing. I don't really want you to talk to me about anything regarding the substance of this matter until we sort through this recusal issue.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: This is what I'm talking about.

THE COURT: Here's the problem. If I make rulings today and you file a motion within 10 days, every ruling \(I\) made today is subject to rehearing by the new judge. So it's a waste of

1 time to proceed and hear any motions if you're in 2 good faith telling me you're going to file a motion to recuse.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not saying that. But I don't know. But I am saying for you to consider that the technologies are owned partially by my father, 30 percent of the interests in them. And that will also, I believe, bring Proskauer into this matter as well. And so, you know, I believe -- like I have obligations, you have obligations under the judicial canons.

THE COURT: Is Proskauer a party now? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah. THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sua sponte disqualify myself from this matter. Had I known that Proskauer was a party, I would have done it when \(I\) reviewed it the first time. But I understood it was just they were attorneys in the case.

So that means, unfortunately, there's going to have to be another assignment of a judge in this matter.

Sir, at this point \(I\) don't really care if you file a motion to recuse. You raised enough for me that I'm going to sua sponte disqualify
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P R O C E E D I N G S
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THE COURT: We're here on the Bernstein case. Everybody ready to go?

MR. ROSE: Good morning, Your Honor. Yes.

Alan Rose on behalf of the plaintiff, Ted S.

Bernstein, as successor trustee.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSE: And with me is my partner, Greg Weiss. May not be for the whole trial, but he is with us for the beginning.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, great. Thanks for coming.

And who's on the other side?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. You're not going to have any counsel? Who's with you at the table?

MR. BERNSTEIN: That's my lovely wife, Candice.

THE COURT: All right. And why are you at the table?

MR. BERNSTEIN: That's one of the questions I would like to address. I'm here individually.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And I was sued individually.

But I'm also here on behalf, supposedly, of my minor children, who aren't represented by counsel.

And I'm sued as a trustee of a trust that I've never possessed.

THE COURT: Are you asking me a question?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: What's the question?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, my children are being sued.

THE COURT: What's the question?
MR. BERNSTEIN: And I was sued as their
trustee, but I'm --
THE COURT: Stop, please.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: I would love to talk with you all day --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: -- but we're not going to have that happen.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: This is not a conversation. This is a trial. So my question is, What is your question? You said you had a question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I tried to get counsel for my children who was willing to make a pro hoc vice --

THE COURT: When will you ask me the question?
Because this is all --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I'd like to stay the proceeding.

THE COURT: Okay. The request for a continuance is denied. Thank you.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Have you read the filing I filed? Because my children are minor --

THE COURT: Was that your question?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, my children are minors - -

THE COURT: Please stop.

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- and they're not represented here.

THE COURT: What is your name again, sir?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bernstein, I'll be courteous, unless it doesn't work; then I'll be more direct and more aggressive in enforcing the rules that \(I\) follow when \(I\) conduct trials.

I've asked you several times if you had questions. You finally asked me one, and it was, Did you read my filing? No, I did not. You asked for a continuance. I have denied that because it's untimely.

Now I'm turning back to the plaintiff, and we're going forward with this trial. That is one day set on my docket. We're going to have this trial done by the end of the day. You'll have half the time to use as you see fit; so will the other side. I'll not care if you waste it, but I'll not participate in that. Thank you.

Now, from the plaintiff's side, what is it that the Court is being asked to decide today?

MR. ROSE: Before I answer, could Mr. Morrissey make an appearance, sir?

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MORRISSEY: Yes, I'm here on behalf of four of the defendants, Judge, four adult grandchildren, Alexandra Bernstein, Eric Bernstein Michael Bernstein and Molly Simon, all of whom have joined in the plaintiff's complaint today.

THE COURT: Okay. Last time I'll ask this question of the plaintiff. What is it that I'm asked to decide today?

MR. ROSE: We are asking you to decide whether five testamentary documents are valid, authentic and enforceable. And that is set forth in count two of the amended complaint in this action. The five documents are a 2008 will of Shirley

Bernstein, a 2008 trust of Shirley Bernstein, and an amendment by Shirley Bernstein to her 2008 trust.

THE COURT: When was the amendment?
MR. ROSE: Amendment was in November of 2008.
THE COURT: All right. So there's also a 2008 amendment?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir. In fact, I have a -- I don't know if you can read it, but I did put up here on the -- there are seven testamentary documents. We believe five of them to be valid and operative, and two of them to have been with -revoked by later documents.

So for Shirley, there are three documents that count two seeks you to determine are valid, authentic and enforceable according to their terms.

And for Simon Bernstein, he has a 2012 will, and a 2012 amended and restated trust agreement. And we're asking that these five documents be validated today.

There also is a 2008 will and trust that you'll hear testimony were prepared, but have been revoked and superseded by later documents.

THE COURT: Does everybody agree that Simon's 2008 will and trust are invalid or is there some
claim that they're valid?

MR. ROSE: I can't answer.

THE COURT: All right. I'll ask.

Are you claiming that the Simon Bernstein 2008 will or 2008 trust are valid, or do you agree that they are invalid?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I individually disagree.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And my children --

THE COURT: I just wanted to know --

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- aren't represented by
counsel, so they can't have an opinion --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- even though they're parties to the case.

THE COURT: Okay. Like I say, you can waste all your time you want. I won't object to it, but I won't participate in it.

You can put on your first witness.

MR. ROSE: Thank you. Plaintiff will call Robert Spallina.

Thereupon,
(ROBERT SPALLINA)
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do.

MR. ROSE: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Sure. All approaches are okay.
MR. ROSE: Okay. I brought for Your Honor --
would you like a book instead of the exhibits?
THE COURT: Nothing better than a huge book.

MR. ROSE: We may not use all of them, but we'll adjust it later.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: And then I was going to hand the witness the original for the admission into the court file as we go.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: I have a book for Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

\section*{DIRECT EXAMINATION}

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Would you state your name for the record?
A. Robert Spallina.
Q. Did you know Simon and Shirley Bernstein, Mr. Spallina?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And when did you first meet Simon and Shirley Bernstein?
A. In 2007.
Q. What was your occupation at the time?
A. I was working as an estate planning attorney.
Q. With a law firm?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the name of the law firm?
A. Tescher, Gutter, Chaves, Rubin, Ruffin and Forman and Fleisher.
Q. And did Simon and Shirley Bernstein retain your law firm?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. I'm going to approach with Exhibit No. 9 -Plaintiff's Exhibit 9. Ask if you'd identify that document?
A. This was an intake sheet to open up the file, dated November 16th of 2007.
Q. And the clients are Simon and Shirley

\section*{Bernstein?}
A. The clients were Simon and Shirley Bernstein, yes.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 9 into evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No verbal response]

THE COURT: No objection being stated, I'll
receive that as Plaintiff's 19.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 9 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, what was the purpose of Simon and Shirley Bernstein retaining your law firm?
A. They wanted to review and go over their existing estate planning and make changes to their documents.
Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit No. 10, and ask you if you can identify for the record Exhibit 10.
A. These are meeting notes, my meeting notes, and -- and then partner Don Tescher's meeting notes from several different meetings that we had with Si and Shirley during the time following them retaining us as clients.
Q. And is it your standard practice to take notes when you're meeting with clients?
A. Yes.
Q. And were these notes kept in your company's files and were they produced with Bates stamp numbers?
A. Yes, they were.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 10 into
evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to the exhibit?
[No verbal response].

THE COURT: No objection being stated, they'll be received as Plaintiff's 10.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 10 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, for today's purposes, are those notes in chronological or reverse chronological order?
A. This is reverse chronological order.
Q. Okay. Can you go to the bottom of the stack and start with the earliest notes. Do they reflect a date?
A. Yes. 11/14/07.
Q. And if you'd turn to the last page, is that your partner's notes that are in evidence?
A. Yes. We both would always take notes at the meetings.
Q. And so the first -- was that the first meeting with Mr. Simon Or Shirley Bernstein?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Now, before you met with Simon and Shirley Bernstein, did you have any prior relationship with them?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Did you personally know either of them before
that date?
A. No, I did not.
Q. 11/14/2007. Okay. And if you'd just flip back to the client intake. I think that was dated November the 26th?
A. It was two days later, 11/16. The file was opened two days later.
Q. So file open.

Now, did you know in advance of the meeting what they were coming in to talk about?
A. Yeah. They were coming in to talk about their estate planning.
Q. And did they provide you in advance of the meeting with any of their prior estate planning documents?
A. I believe we had copies of documents. I don't know if they provided them at that meeting or if they provided them before for us to look at, or after, but I know that there were existing documents that were in our file.
Q. Okay. Let me approach and hand you Exhibit 40A, which is -- bears Tescher Spallina Number 1.

Does that appear to be an envelope from Stephen Greenwald --
A. Yes.
Q. -- directed to Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And copy of this was in your files when they were produced?
A. Yes.
Q. And was Stephen Greenwald the prior lawyer that represented Simon and Shirley Bernstein, as far as you know?
A. Yes. Yes, he was.
Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 40B, which is a letter from Mr. Greenwald to Simon and Shirley Bernstein.

Is that also -- is that also provided in your files?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Does it bear a Bates stamp of your law firm?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. And does Mr. Greenwald, in that letter, disclose what he is sending to Simon --

Mr. and Mrs. Simon L. Bernstein?
A. Yes, he did. Their estate planning documents, including their ancillary documents, their wills, their trusts, health care powers, durable powers and living wills.
Q. And if -- I'll show you 40C, D, E and F, and ask if you can identify these as some of the documents that were included with the letter from Mr. Greenwald?
A. We have each of the first codicils to Mr. and Mrs. Bernstein's wills, and we have each of their wills.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 40A through F into evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: No objection being stated, I'm
going to receive this as Plaintiff's 40A through F.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 40A-F were received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Within Exhibit 40 , is there a will and a -for Simon and a will for Shirley?
A. Yes, there is.
Q. And could you tell the court the date of those documents?
A. August 15, 2000 .

THE COURT: Are both documents the same date?

THE WITNESS: Yes, they are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks. I just wanted
to make sure \(I\) don't get confused.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Can you generally describe what the estate plan reflected in Exhibit 40 would be, who are the beneficiaries and what percentages?
A. Okay. Just give me a minute. I haven't seen these in...

The plan under the documents -- and let me just make sure it's the same under both documents. The plan under the documents was to provide all the assets to the survivor of Shirley and Si, and that at the death of the survivor of the two of them, assets would pass to -- it appears to be Ted, Pam, Eliot, Jill and Sue and Lisa -- and Lisa. So it looks to be a typical estate plan; everything would pass to the survivor at the first death, and then at the second death everything to the children.
Q. How many of the children under the 2000 documents?
A. This shows all five. The will shows all five.
Q. What page are you looking at?
A. The first page of the will. Is this -- oh, no. That's just as to tangible personal property. I'm sorry.
Q. That's okay. Are you on -- are you in Simon's or Shirley's?
A. I'm in -- on both documents, to make sure the disposition was the same.
Q. Okay. So on the page -- the first page, it talks under --
A. It speaks to tangible personal property.
Q. Split equally among the five children?
A. Among the five children.
Q. Let me just stop you one second right there. If you would, turn --

MR. ROSE: This might help, Your Honor, if you'd turn to Tab 7. It may be out of order. Might be a good time just to go over the family tree and let -- get everyone on the same page of...

We prepared a chart, and I'm going to put the -- it lists Simon and Shirley and the names of their children on the second line, and then under each child with arrows, the names of the grandchildren and which parents they belong to.

THE WITNESS: This looks accurate.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 7 into evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: No objection being stated, that's in evidence as Plaintiff's 7.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 7 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. So under the 2000 documents, for personal property, it's split among the five children.

And when you get to the residuary estate or the amount that was put into trusts, who are the beneficiaries?
A. Again, at the death of the survivor of the two of them, tangible personal property would go to the five children, and the residuary of the estate would go to four of the five children. It appears that Pam is cut out of these documents. And I recall that now, yes.
Q. Okay. So under the 2000 documents, Eliot Bernstein would get 25 percent of the residuary?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, if you look at page 5, it talks about -- page 5, near the top, it says "upon the death of my husband," then "the principal of his trust shall pass," and then the next sentence says "to the extent that said power of appointment -- oh, "and such shares equal or unequal and subject to such lawful trust terms and conditions as my husband shall by will appoint."

Do you see what I'm talking about?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. That's a power of appointment?
A. Correct.
Q. And then it says, the next sentence, To the extent the power of appointment is not effectively exercised, then it goes to the four of the five children?
A. Correct.
Q. So under the 2000 documents, the survivor would have the power to give it all to one?
A. Correct.
Q. And theoretically change it and give some to Pam?
A. That's true, by the language of this document.
Q. Okay. So I'm just going to write. We have a power of appointment, which we don't need to belabor, in favor of the survivor; and then if it's not exercised, Eliot gets 25 percent, and three other siblings get the balance?
A. 25 percent each.
Q. Okay.
A. Equal shares.
Q. Now, when Simon and Shirley came to you, did they give you an indication whether they wanted to keep in place the 2000 structure?
A. No. They wanted to change the dispositions
under their documents.
Q. Okay. So if we work through your notes now, which are in evidence as Exhibit No. 10, the first meeting was November the 14th, 2007. You had a discussion about Simon's net worth -- Simon and Shirley's net worth, how much money they had at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to show you Exhibit No. 12 before we --

Do you recognize the handwriting on Exhibit 12?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I believe it's Simon Bernstein's statement of his net worth.

But you have seen this document before?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. And you're not familiar with his handwriting to --
A. No. Other than his signature.
Q. That's fine.

But during the discussion, did you discuss Simon's net worth?
A. Yes. Both my partner and I.
Q. And if I look at Mr. Tescher's notes, which
are a little easier to read, he lists the joint brokerage account, some money for Simon, Simon, a house -- the house appears to have a million dollar mortgage -- a condo, some miscellaneous and some life insurance. And he totals -- that totals to 13 million, and then he lists 5 million for 33 shares of the company.

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. So if I add up what Mr. Tescher wrote in his notes, \(I\) get to about \(\$ 18\) million.

And this is on November the 14th of 107, around 18 million, but that includes life insurance?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Okay. Now, did you meet with them -- how long were these meetings with Simon and Shirley Bernstein?
A. They could be an hour; sometimes more.
Q. Now, if we flip through your notes, does it reflect a second meeting?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And what's the date of the second meeting?
A. 12/19/07.
Q. And do you have any -- I'm sorry. 12/19?
A. 12/19/07.
Q. Okay. And what's the -- let's just put all
the dates up here. That was the second meeting.
Are there notes from a third meeting?
A. The next meeting was January 31, '08.
Q. Okay. Is there a fourth meeting?
A. March 12 of '08.
Q. Now, just to put this in perspective, the document that we are going to -- well, the document that's been admitted into probate in this case is a will of Shirley Bernstein that bears a date of May 20, 2008.

Does that sound consistent with your memory?
A. Yeah, it was clearly 2008.

MRS. CANDICE BERNSTEIN: Excuse me. Can you
turn that so we can see it?
THE WITNESS: Sure. Sorry.
THE COURT: Ma'am, you are not a party. You are not an attorney. And you are not really supposed to be sitting there. I'm letting you sit there as a courtesy. If you ask for and inject yourself any further in the proceeding than that, I'll have to ask you to be seated in the gallery. Do you understand?

MRS. CANDICE BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Thank you.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. So you have four meetings with Simon and

Shirley Bernstein.
And did it take that long to go over what they wished to do with their estate planning documents?
A. It was more of us, you know, trying to get a handle on everything that they had, the business, prior planning. From the first meeting to the March meeting, it was only a couple of months. The holidays were in there. So it wasn't uncommon for us to meet with a client more than once or twice when they had a sophisticated plan and asset schedule.
Q. At this time --
A. By the last meeting, we knew what we needed to do.
Q. And around this -- based on your notes, did Simon Bernstein believe he had a net worth all in of about 18 million when he met with you?
A. Yeah, it appears that way, 18, 19 million dollars.
Q. And did he discuss at all with you that he was involved in a business at that time, an insurance business?
A. Yes.
Q. And did he give you an indication of how well the business was doing at around the times of these meetings between November 2007 and March or May of 2008?
A. Yeah, the business was doing well at that time. He was -- he was very optimistic about the future of the business.
Q. Now, did you do any -- did you prepare any documents before the will was signed in May? Did you prepare drafts of the documents?
A. Yes, we did. We always prepare drafts of documents.
Q. And did you share the drafts with simon and Shirley?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 11, and ask if you can identify that for the record?
A. This is a letter from our firm dated April 19 of 2008. It's transmitting the documents to the client, with an explanation that they could follow, better than reading their documents -- a summary of the documents.
Q. Is that a true and authentic copy of a document that you created?
A. Yes, it appears to be.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 11 into
evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: All right. Then that's in
evidence as Plaintiff's 11.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 11 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. And if I read Exhibit 11, the first three words say, "Enclosed are drafts of each of your wills and revocable trusts, the children's family trust, each of your durable powers of attorney, designations of health care surrogate and living wills," correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So about a month and 11 days before anything was signed, documents were sent by Federal Express to Simon and Shirley Bernstein?
A. Correct.
Q. And it appears to have gone to Simon's business?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, if you look at -- does your -- does your letter, sort of in laymen's terms, rather than reading through the legalese of a will, explain what the estate planning was under the documents that have yet to be signed but that you were preparing?
A. Yes, it does, as much as possible in laymen's terms.
Q. Can you just give us a short -- well, the will
itself for both Simon and Shirley was a relatively simple will that poured over into a revocable trust, one for each?
A. Yes, poured over wills for both.
Q. And whoever died first would inherent the personal property?
A. All tangible personal property under the will would pass to the survivor.
Q. So assuming Simon survived Shirley, he would be the sole beneficiary of her estate?
A. Correct.
Q. And then any of her residuary would go into a trust?
A. That's correct.
Q. And he, in fact, outlived Shirley?
A. He did.
Q. Okay. Now, if you go to the second page, at the top, you describe the will of Shirley Bernstein. It's essentially identical to Si -- it says "Si."

Just for the record, that's Simon shorthand?
A. Yes.
Q. Si is the personal representative of Shirley's estate, and Ted is designated as successor if Simon is unable to serve.

That was what was in the document you sent in

April?
A. Yes. I believe so, yes.
Q. And that provision remained in the final documents you signed?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, did Ted eventually become a successor personal representative upon Simon's death?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Then you next start to talk about the Simon \(L\). Bernstein trust agreement.

And theoretically, that was going to be the primary testamentary document?
A. Correct, it was.
Q. And that's fairly standard?
A. Yes. When a client wants to avoid probate, we use a revocable trust to title assets in prior to death. Those assets remain confidential; they're not part of the court record. And the trust is also used to avoid the need for the appointment of a guardian in the event of incapacity, because there's a successor trustee mechanism.
Q. Okay. Now, under Simon's trust agreement, moving down to the third paragraph, under that heading, it says that both trusts provide for mandatory income distributions. And then the next sentence starts, "Upon

Shirley's death, she has been given a special power to appoint the remaining assets of both the marital trust and the family trust to any of your lineal descendants and their spouses, a power to redirect and reallocate."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, is that consistent with the way the documents were intended to be drafted?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And I guess it's sort of similar to what existed in the 2000 wills?
A. Yes. Typically, you give the survivor of the spouse a power to appoint in the event that they want to change any of the estate planning of the first to die. Found in most first marriage documents with only children from that marriage.
Q. And this is a first marriage with all five children being the product of the same marriage --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as far as you know?
A. As far as I know.
Q. And as far as you know, Simon and Shirley Bernstein, they each married only once in their lifetime, to each other?
A. That's all I know.
Q. If you flip to the next page, there's a shorter paragraph for Shirley.

It basically says -- it's virtually identical, except that simon is the initial successor, and after that, Ted would be Simon's replacement if he passed away?
A. Correct.
Q. And is that the mechanism by which Ted Bernstein became the successor trustee in this lawsuit?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, if Shirley died first, then did the documents give simon the same power of appointment over the assets in her trust that was provided for in the Simon document if he died?
A. Same power of appointment was in both documents. They were identical documents, with one exception.
Q. And what was the exception; the name of the successor trustee?
A. The name of the successor trustee.
Q. And then Simon wanted his then business partner, Bill Stansbury, to be his successor trustee in both his will and his trust, and Shirley wanted her oldest son, Ted, to be her successor in both documents?
A. Correct. The signer, non-survivor.
Q. Okay. And Shirley, I guess it says here, also made a specific gift of \(\$ 200,000\) to someone named Matthew Logan?
A. Correct.
Q. If you look at our family tree chart, I think Matthew Logan is under Ted.

He is the son of Ted's second wife, Deborah?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So there was a \(\$ 200,000\) special gift to Matthew that was in the documents that you sent on April 9th?
A. Correct.
Q. Then you prepared family trusts for the children.

> Were those trusts created at the time?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Now, after you sent your letter on April 9th, did you have a further discussion with Simon and Shirley before the documents were signed?
A. I can't recall, but we probably -- we probably did, to set up a meeting and talk -- you know, either, A, talk about the documents, the draft documents, any changes that they wanted to make on the draft documents. It would be typical of us to do that, although I don't have any meeting notes that showed that, so...
Q. Now, under -- we'll talk -- let's talk about the ones that matter.

Because Shirley died first, her 2008 trust became the beneficiary of her estate?
A. Correct.
Q. And then Simon had a power of appointment, correct?
A. Um-hum.
Q. And if -- you have to say yes or no.
A. Yes.
Q. And if he didn't exercise the power of appointment, was there a default set of beneficiaries that were designated in the documents you drafted in 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the default set of beneficiaries?
A. Simon had and Shirley had in their documents excluded Pam and Ted at the death of the survivor of the two of them.
Q. Okay. So if the power of appointment was not properly exercised, it would just go to three, and Eliot would end up with 33 and a third percent and two of the other sisters would get the balance?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did Simon and Shirley eventually execute
documents in 2008?
A. Yes, they did.
Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit No. 1, which
```

is --

```
A. A copy of Si's will from --
Q. Do you have Exhibit 1?
A. Excuse me. Sorry. Shirley's will.
Q. Is that a conformed copy of the document?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 1 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]
THE COURT: That's in evidence as

Plaintiff's 1.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 1 was received into
evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, that says "conformed copy." If I turn to the last page, there's no handwritten signatures.
A. Correct.
Q. Do you know where the original of that document sits today?
A. It was filed with the court.
Q. Okay. So somewhere in the courthouse, the
original goes.
And that's something that the client would keep?
A. Correct. This is what we would send to the client to include with their files.
Q. When you filed the original with the court, did anyone object while Simon was alive?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I'm going to hand you Exhibit No. 2. Do you recognize that document?
A. Yes. This is Shirley's trust agreement that she executed in 2008.
Q. Now, does that document have copies of her signature?
A. Yes. These are actual copies of the signing parties and their signatures.
Q. And how many originals would have been created of this document?
A. We always created three originals of the trust agreements.
Q. Okay. Now, if you turn to the next -- if you turn to the last page, it says that Shirley put a dollar into her trust when it was created.
A. Yes.
Q. And that's to make it a valid trust?
A. Yeah, I mean, it's not required today, but it's pretty much just form to show a dollar. She had certainly funded it more than that.
Q. And eventually Shirley put some assets into the trust?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And if you go to the page before that, page 27 , it appears to be a signature page, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, were you one of the witnesses to the signature of Shirley Bernstein on Exhibit 2?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And were you present with Shirley Bernstein and the other witness, Traci Kratish, at the time of the execution of the documents?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And they're notarized by someone named Kimberly Moran.

Does she work for your office?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. And through her involvement with your firm and -- did she personally know Shirley and Traci

Kratish, as well as yourself?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Now, at the same time that Shirley signed her
documents, did Simon sign a similar set of 2008 will and trust, similar to the drafts that were sent in April?
A. Yes, he did. We were all sitting in the main conference area in their offices together.
Q. In Simon's office or your office?
A. In Simon's offices.
Q. Okay. So why would someone from your office come to Simon's office rather than rely on the notary that they have there?
A. Because we wanted to accommodate Shirley and Si in their offices and not have them travel.
Q. You personally went there. Did you personally go through to make sure that the documents were signed with all the formalities required under Florida law to make them valid and enforceable?
A. Yes, we did. That's why we were there.
Q. And if Simon did not have a 2008 will and -- sorry.

If Simon did not have a 2002 will and trust, would it be your belief that the 2008 will and trust would be valid?
A. Yes.
Q. Were they properly signed with all the same testamentary formalities required by Florida law?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Okay. Did Shirley at some point amend her trust agreement?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. And do you recall why she amended it?
A. She amended it to remove Matt Logan from the document that she had included previously as a specific device.
Q. Do you know why Matt was removed?
A. It's attorney-client privilege.

Does it matter?
Q. I'll withdraw the question.

Was Matthew removed at the direction of Shirley?
A. Yes.
Q. I'll withdraw --
A. Yes. Yes. Yes.
Q. Did Shirley sign a document that effectively removed Matthew?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Let me hand you Exhibit No. 3, and ask you if you recognize that document?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, was this document signed with the same testamentary formalities as the 2008 trust?
A. Yes, it was.

MR. ROSE: We would move Exhibit 3 into evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence as Plaintiff's 3.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 3 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, if you look -- there's a paragraph 1 and a paragraph 3, but no paragraph 2.

Do you know why that is?
A. It's just a mistake in drafting.
Q. And did you specifically discuss with Shirley, whose privilege I technically would control -- my client would control --

Did you specifically discuss with Shirley the fact that the effect of the first amendment would be to remove the specific gift that she had made for Matthew Logan?
A. Yes. Even prior to the signing of the document.
Q. And is this the last relevant testamentary document that Shirley ever signed that you're aware of?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Did you meet with Simon and Shirley in person to talk about this amendment?
A. Si had called me and said that Shirley had a change to her documents, and asked me to give her a call and have lunch with her. I called her. We arranged for a meeting in her house to execute the document.
Q. Now, you brought your -- you brought Kimberly with you to get -- for convenience and to make sure the documents were properly executed?
A. Correct. She had -- she had her personal assistant that was there, Rachel Walker, to serve as another witness.
Q. Just so I don't have to go back, what's the date of the amendment?
A. November 18th, 2008.
Q. So now we five documents that exist; 2008, will, trust, will, trust, and an amendment to Shirley's trust.

Did you share any of those documents with any of Simon and Shirley's children at that time?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Did any of the -- did any of the children play any role in bringing Simon or Shirley to your offices?
A. Not that I'm aware, no.
Q. Did any of the children accompany them
to -- any time they came to visit you, did any of the children come with them, drag them along?
A. No.
Q. So you prepared -- did you do some other estate planning in addition to the 2008 testamentary documents?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Can you briefly describe some of the things you did?
A. We had set up a Florida limited partnership. We created a general partner entity for that partnership, a limited liability company.
Q. What's the name of the Florida limited partnership?
A. Bernstein Family Investments, LLLP.
Q. Was that an entity that was in existence or was it created under your direction?

THE COURT: Can \(I\) stop you a second? Is this going to help me figure out the validity of the testamentary documents?

MR. ROSE: Only in the very narrowest sense.
I'm just trying to establish that they had a very
lengthy and extensive relationship, and they did a lot of estate planning for Simon and Shirley. But I'll be very brief.

THE COURT: Well, if that becomes relevant later, perhaps you could come back to it. But I don't see the relevance at this point, so I'll ask you to move on.

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, was Simon concerned at all about asset protection as part of some of the things you discussed?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Now, we have -- did you have any discussion with him about who was expected to live longer or if either of them had health problems that you had any knowledge of?
A. Si was not -- he was in good health, but he had had some heart issues. And Shirley had had other issues as well. And I think it -- early on, he didn't know, but as the relationship went on, we kind of knew that Shirley was sicker than him and would probably pass first.
Q. So Shirley died -- it's in the public record -- but December --
A. 2010, yeah.
Q. -- 8th. So Simon was her -- he survived her; he becomes the sole beneficiary as far as tangible personal property under her will?
A. Yes, he does.
Q. The residuary goes into the Shirley Bernstein

Trust?
A. That's correct.
Q. He's the sole successor trustee and the sole beneficiary --
A. Yes, he is.
Q. -- during the term of his life?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, was there a great deal of effort put into inventorying the assets, things like that?
A. No, there wasn't. For purposes of opening up Shirley's probate, we had asked Si to estimate the value of, you know, her tangible personal property. And that's what we included on the inventory that was filed in the probate.
Q. Now, if I'm correct, 2010 was the year there were no estate taxes at all?
A. No estate taxes.
Q. Simon's the sole beneficiary?
A. Sole beneficiary. Even if there were taxes, there wouldn't have been any tax on the first death, because everything went to si, and there was a marital deduction.
Q. While Simon was alive, did Ted have any access
to the documents, as far as you know? Did you ever send the testamentary documents of Simon or Shirley to Ted?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Did Ted play any role in the administration of the estate while Simon was alive?
A. No, he did not.
Q. Did any of the other children play any role in the administration of the estate while Simon was alive?
A. No, they did not.
Q. Now, did you have to -- well, strike that.

Because it was only Simon, was it sort of the decision by Simon, That \(I\) don't want to spend a lot of time and money in this estate because it's just wasting my own money?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's not unusual in a situation where you have a surviving spouse that's the sole beneficiary?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, did there come a point in time when Pam, who was not a named beneficiary of the -- Shirley's documents, learned of the fact that she had been excluded?
A. Yes, there was.
Q. Okay. And did you get involved with discussions with Pam or her lawyer?
A. She had hired an attorney, who had made a request to get a copy of her mother's documents. And I called Si, spoke to Si about it, and he authorized me giving Pam those documents -- or her attorney those documents.
Q. Were they provided to any of the other children; that would be Ted or his brother, Eliot, or his two sisters, Lisa or Jill?
A. No, they were not.
Q. And did Simon Bernstein at some point decide to change his testamentary documents?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Do you recall approximately when that happened?
A. Early 2012, he called and requested that we meet to go over his documents.
Q. I'm going to hand you an exhibit marked Exhibit 13, and ask you if you recognize those as your own notes?
A. Yes. These are my notes from that meeting in 2012 .

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 13 into
evidence, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence as Plaintiff's 13 then.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 13 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, during this meeting, did Simon discuss the possibility of altering his estate plan?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Did you also go over his current finances?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Now, we've seen from 2007 that he had disclosed about \(\$ 18\) million.

As part of the meeting in February of 2012, he gave you sort of a summary of where he stood at that time?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And what was the status of the Shirley Bernstein probate administration in early 2012, about 13 months after she passed away?
A. It was still not closed.
Q. Do you know why it was not closed?
A. I think that we were still waiting -- I'm not sure that -- we were still waiting on waivers and releases from the children to close the estate, to qualify beneficiaries under the estate if Si were to
die. We had to get waivers and releases from them.
Q. Standard operating procedure?
A. Standard operating procedure.
Q. Okay. So Simon here, it says -- it says at the top "SIPC receivable."

Do you know what that is?
A. Yes, I do. That was -- Si had made an investment in a Stanford product that was purported to be a \(C D\); it was an offshore \(C D\). And when the Stanford debacle hit, I guess he filed a claim with SIPC to get those monies back, because it was supposedly a cash investment.
Q. And so he invested in a Ponzi scheme and lost a bunch of money?
A. Correct.
Q. Some of the 18 million he had in 2007 he lost in the next four and a half years in investing in a Ponzi scheme?
A. That's correct.
Q. And then the maximum that the SIPC -- which is like the FDIC for investments.

You're familiar with that, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The maximum is 500,000.

You don't actually necessarily recover

500,000? You have a receivable, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you know how much he actually realized from the SIPC?
A. I believe he never received anything.
Q. Okay. And then it said, LIC receivable, \$100,000.

Am I reading that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And LIC was the company he was involved, with others?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So I put here 600 that he put, but the 600 is really probably closer to 100 if you didn't get the SIPC money?
A. Correct.
Q. So I'm going to just put a little star here and put it's really 100,000, and sort that out.

So then he says -- he has -- Si's estate, this would be his personal assets. He's got an interest in the LLLP.

That is not relevant to discuss how it was formed, but there was an LLLP that was owned, some by Si's trust, some by Shirley's trust?
A. Correct.
Q. And at the time, he thought the value was 1,150,000 for his share?
A. That's correct.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I object, Your Honor?
THE COURT: What's the objection?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. And then he had an IRA that says 750,000 .
A. Correct.
Q. And those two things totaled 1,550,000?
A. No. They totaled one million nine. Right?
Q. Okay. You're right.

You wrote next to it "estate tax."

What does that mean, on the side next to it?
A. I think what I had done was offset the value of the assets in his estate by the loans that were outstanding at the time.
Q. And it shows a million seven in loans?
A. A million seven in loans.
Q. So we had loans back in 2008 -- I'm sorry. November of 2007 time period -- or 2008, which were only -- so we have loans now, you said, a million seven?
A. Well, he had a \$l.2 million loan with

JP Morgan that was collateralized with the assets of the LLLP.
Q. And then you list -- just to speed up, then you have -- underneath that, it says Shirley's asset was empty, right? Because whatever was in had gone to Simon?
A. Yeah, her estate had nothing in it.
Q. She had a Bentley, I think, when she died.

Do you know what happened to the Bentley?
A. I wasn't aware that she had a Bentley.
Q. Did you come to learn that she had a Bentley and Simon gave it to his girlfriend, and she traded it in at the dealership and got a Range Rover?
A. Much, much, much later on --
Q. But you know --
A. -- after Si's death.
Q. But you know that to be the case?
A. I wasn't aware that it was traded for the Range Rover. I thought he bought her the Range Rover. I didn't realize he used a Bentley to do it.
Q. Okay. Somehow you know the Bentley became something for Maritza?
A. Yes.
Q. That's the name of his girlfriend?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Then it says, in Shirley's trust, condo, one million -- I'm sorry. I should go to the next column. It says "FMV."

That would be shorthand for Fair Market Value?
A. Yes.
Q. So condo, 2 million, which is here; house, 3 million; half of the LLLP, which is Shirley's half after -- I assume, after the deduction of the loan, was \(800,000 ?\)
A. Um-hum.
Q. Then it says "LIC." That's the company Life Insurance Concepts that Mr. -- that Simon, his son Ted, and a gentleman named Bill Stansbury had formally been involved, another attorney, shares by then. Because we're in February of 2012.

But, in any event, that's Simon's company?
A. Correct.
Q. And he told you in 2007 it was worth -Mr. Tescher's -- notes, like -- his interest was worth 5 million.

What did he tell you it was worth in 2012?
A. Zero.
Q. Then underneath that -- I put zero here, so zero today.

So his net worth -- and then there was a home
that he owned for -- that Eliot lives in, right? He didn't really own it, but he controlled it, Simon?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you set up the entity that owned the home?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Just to save time, there's an entity called Bernstein Family Realty that owns the house.

Simon controlled that entity while he was alive?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And his estate holds a mortgage on the house for 365,000?
A. Correct.
Q. So there's some interest there.

He didn't put it on his sheet when he talked to you, but that still would have existed in some form, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it still exists to this day.

We don't know the value of it, but there still is a mortgage, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But either way, the point of this whole story is, his net worth went down significantly between

2007 and 2012?
A. Yes, it did.
Q. And in your world, that's not uncommon, with the stock market crash, the depression, things like that, that a lot of clients with high net worth would have suffered losses during that time?
A. Many, many of them did. And even the values that are on this sheet were not the real values.
Q. We know that the --
A. Clients have a tendency to overstate their net worth.
Q. All right. And we know the Ocean Drive house sold for about a million four?
A. Correct.
Q. And the Court -- there's an order that approved the sale, the gross sale price of a million one for St. Andrews?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So that's still -- that's less than half, even then, Simon thought he would get.

Now, if you look at the bottom of the Exhibit No. 13, it says a word, begins with an "I." I can't really read it.

Can you read that?
A. Insurance.
Q. Well, did you have some discussions with Simon about his insurance?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. In fact, I think -- Mr. Spallina, we talked about he had -- I'm sorry.

Mr. Tescher's notes had a \(\$ 2\) million life
insurance?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Is this the same life insurance?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And was there a discussion about -- I guess it says 1 million --

That's one million seven-fifty?
A. A million 75 -- yeah, one million seven-fifty was the value of the policy.
Q. And the death benefit was a million six?
A. Million six. There was a small loan or something against the policy.
Q. Okay. And then it says "Maritza."

What was Maritza down there for?
A. Si was considering changing -- the purpose of the meeting was to meet, discuss his assets. And he was, you know, having a lot of, I guess, internal -- he had received another letter from his daughter -- he asked me to read the letter from Pam -- that she still
was not happy about the fact that she had been disinherited under her mother's documents if the assets were to pass under the documents and he didn't exercise his power of appointment. And this meeting was to kind of figure out a way, with the assets that he had, to take care of everybody; the grandchildren, the children, and Maritza.

And so he thought maybe that he would change the beneficiary designation on his life insurance to include her. And we had talked about providing for her, depending on -- an amount -- an increasing scale, depending on the number of years that he was with her.
Q. So if you look at the bottom, it says 0 to 2 years, 250.

Is that what you're referring to?
A. Yes. Two to four years, 500,000. And then anything over plus-four years would be -- I think that's 600,000.
Q. Now, during this discussion, was Simon mentally sharp and aware of what was going on?
A. Oh, yeah. Yeah, he was -- he was the same Simon. He was just -- you know, he was struggling with his estate now. He was getting -- he felt -- I guess he was getting pulled. He had a girlfriend that wanted something. He had his daughter who, you know, felt like
she had been slighted. And he wanted to try to make good by everybody.
Q. And at that point in time, other than the house that he had bought that Eliot lived in, were you aware that he was supporting Eliot with a very significant amount of money each year?
A. I was not.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Object to the relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Okay. So that's February.
A. Yes.
Q. What happens next in relation to Simon coming in to meet with you to talk about changing his documents?
A. He had called me on the phone and he -- we talked again about, you know, him changing his documents. He had been thinking about giving his estate and Shirley's estate to his grandchildren. And at the February meeting, I did not think it was a great idea for him to include his girlfriend, Maritza, as a beneficiary of the life insurance policy.
Q. He took your advice? He didn't change that, as far as you know?
A. He did not.
Q. Okay. I'm sorry. Continue.
A. He did not.

I had suggested that he provide for her in other ways; a joint account that would pass to her at his death, but not to mix her in with his family in their dispositive documents. And he ultimately took that advice and decided that he wanted to give his estate to his ten grandchildren, and that the policy -which \(I\) had never seen a copy of the policy, but, you know -- he had had. And I knew that he was paying for it, because -- it almost lapsed, or did lapse at one point, and it got reinstated -- that that policy was to pass to an insurance trust that named his five children as beneficiaries.
Q. And that's something Simon specifically discussed with you when you were going over his estate planning in 2012?
A. Correct -- or something that we had known about before that meeting. But he was -- at the meeting, he was starting to talk about doing a change to the beneficiary designation to include Maritza, and I wanted to talk him out of that.
Q. And at some point, he made a decision to actually change his documents, correct?
A. He did. He did.
Q. And did he direct you to set up any kind of a communication with his children?
A. Yes. He said, I want you to get -- put together a conference call with me and you and my five children so I can talk to them about what I want to do with my estate and Shirley's estate.

THE COURT: All right. This would be a good time for us to take a pause for a morning break. We'll be in session again in 10 minutes.

As far as time use goes, so far Plaintiff's side has used 60 minutes. So you have 90 remaining in your portion of the day. And that's where we stand.

MR. ROSE: We'll be well within our time, sir.
THE COURT: Great. Okay.
We'll be in recess for ten minutes. Is ten
minutes enough time for everybody? That's what
it'll be then.
(A break was taken.)
THE COURT: We're ready to proceed. Please continue.

MR. ROSE: Thank you.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. I think we were when Shirley died in December of 2010, and you meet with Si, according to

Plaintiff's 13, on February 1st of 2012.
I think by May of 2012 was when this
conference call that you mentioned was?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Okay. And did the five children attend the conference call?
A. Yes, they all did.
Q. Were you present on the call?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. Was Simon present?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Where was Simon physically during the call?
A. His office -- I believe his office.
Q. Were you in the same room as Simon?
A. No, I was not.
Q. You were in your office?
A. I was in my office.
Q. Okay. Generally, what was discussed during this conference call?
A. Simon wanted to talk to his children about providing for his estate and his wife's estate to go to the ten grandchildren; wanted to have a discussion with his children and see what they thought about that.
Q. And was he asking them for their approval or permission or...
A. Well, I think he wanted to see what they all thought, you know, based on things that had happened in the past and documents that had been created in the past. And I don't know that it was going to sway his opinion, but when he told me, you know, to -- you know, to have the conference call, to contact his -- he said, This is what I'm going to do, so...
Q. During the call, did Simon ask his children if anybody had an objection to him leaving his and Shirley's wealth to the ten grandchildren?
A. Yes. He asked what everybody thought.
Q. Did Eliot respond?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. What did he say?
A. I'm paraphrasing, but he said something to the effect of, Dad, you know, whatever you want to do, whatever makes you happy, that's what's important.
Q. Did you also discuss during that call the need to close Shirley's estate?
A. Yes, we did. We had told Si that we needed to get back the waivers of accounting, the releases, and we asked -- he asked them to get those back to us as soon as possible.
Q. Okay. If I hand you Exhibit 14, it appears to be an email from Eliot Bernstein to you addressing the
waiver that he needed to sign?
A. Yes, it is.

MR. ROSE: I move Exhibit 14 into evidence.
THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]
THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence then as Plaintiff's 14.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 14 was received into evidence.)

MR. ROSE: As a matter of housekeeping, Your Honor, I think I might have failed to move in Exhibit 2, which is Shirley Bernstein's 2008 trust agreement, which I would move, to the extent it's not in evidence, 1, 2 and 3, which are the operative documents Mr. Spallina's already testified about.

THE COURT: Any objection?
MR. BERNSTEIN: What was that? I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Is there any objection to
Plaintiff's 1, which is the will of Shirley
Bernstein, Plaintiff's 2, which is the Shirley
Bernstein Trust Agreement, and Plaintiff's 3, which
is the First Amendment to the Shirley Bernstein
Trust Agreement?
MR. BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: All right. Those are all in evidence then as Plaintiff's 1, 2 and 3.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 2 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Okay. This email is dated May -- May 17, 2012, from Eliot, correct?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. This would have been after the conference call?
A. This, I believe, was after the conference call, yep.
Q. And he says he's attached the waiver accounting and portions of petition for discharge, waiver of service for a petition for discharge, and receipt of beneficiary and consent to discharge that he had signed.

Did you receive those from Eliot?
A. Yes, I did. We received -- that was the first waivers that we received.
Q. Then it says "as I mentioned in the phone call."

Did you have any separate phone calls with Eliot Bernstein, you and he, or is he referring to the conference call?
A. I think he's referring to the conference call.
Q. Okay. I have not yet -- "I have not seen any of the underlying estate documents or my mother's will at this point, yet \(I\) signed this document after our family call so that my father can be released of his duties as personal representative and put whatever matters that were causing him stress to rest."

Do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Now, while Simon was alive, did you ever get authorization to share the testamentary documents with Eliot Bernstein?
A. I did not.
Q. Now, after the call and after the discussion with the siblings, did you prepare a draft of -- of new documents for Simon?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 15; ask if that's a letter that you sent to Simon Bernstein enclosing some new drafts?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Now, what's the date of that?
A. May 24th, 2012.
Q. And what's -- what is the summary -- well, strike that.

You sent this letter to Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. By FedEx to his home?
A. Yes, I did.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 15 in evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence as Plaintiff's 15.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 15 was received into evidence.) BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Okay. So then first page says, "Dear Si, we have prepared drafts of a new will and an amended and restated trust agreement."

Are those the 2012 documents that were his final ones?
A. Yes, they are.
Q. Okay. Then you sort of do the same thing you did in 2008; you give a little summary of what the estate plan is.
"Your amended and restated trust provides that on your death, your assets will be divided among and held in separate trusts for your then living
grandchildren," correct? I was reading paragraph -- the middle paragraph.
A. Yes, I see that. Yes.
Q. I actually skipped the part above, which is probably more important, which says -- in the middle of the first paragraph, it says, "In addition, you have exercised the special power of appointment granted to you under Shirley's trust agreement in favor of your grandchildren who survive you."

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so that was Simon's intent as discussed on the conference call?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Do you know if you made any changes to these draft documents from May 24 th until the day they were signed?
A. I don't believe so. If I did, it was for grammar or something else. The dispositive plan that was laid out in this memo was ultimately the subject of the documents that he executed in July.
Q. I'm going to hand you Exhibit 16, which is a durable power of attorney.

If you flip to Exhibit 16, the last page, does it bear a signature of Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. And it indicates you were a witness to the signature?
A. Yes.
Q. Along with Kimberly Moran, who is someone from your office?
A. Correct.
Q. And someone named Lindsay Baxley notarized the documents?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Do you know who Lindsay Baxley was?
A. Lindsay Baxley worked in Ted and Si's office.
Q. She was like a secretary?
A. Assistant to Ted, I believe, maybe.
Q. Okay. And if you look at --

MR. ROSE: Well, first of all, I'll move

Exhibit 16 into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]

THE COURT: No objection made, then I'll
receive this as Plaintiff's 16.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 16 was received into
evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. If you look at the last page where the notary
block is there, it says "personally known" with an underline, or "produced identification" with an underline. And she's checked the box "personally known" -- or she's checked the line.

Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So do you believe that -- did you know Lindsay Baxley by that point in time?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you believe -- she obviously knew Simon, she knew Kim Moran from other dealings between your offices?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you all sign this durable power of attorney with testamentary formalities?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And what's the date of that?
A. July 25, 2012.
Q. I'm going to approach with Exhibit 4, and ask you if you recognize Exhibit 4?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And what is Exhibit 4?
A. This is Si's new will that he executed in 2012, on July 25th, the same day as that durable power of attorney.
Q. Now, were you present when Simon executed his new will, which is Exhibit 4?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. If you turn to the last page --

Well, actually, if you turn to the first page, does it say "copy" and bear a clerk's stamp?
A. It does.
Q. Okay.

MR. ROSE: I would represent to the Court that

I went to the clerk's office -- unlike with Shirley's will, I went to the clerk's office and obtained a -- like, a copy made by the clerk of the document itself, rather than have the typewritten conformed copy.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I object to that?

THE COURT: What's the objection?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Is he making a statement? I'm not sure --

THE COURT: You're asking me a question. I don't know.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm objecting. Is that a statement?

THE COURT: The objection is? What are you objecting to?

MR. BERNSTEIN: With the statement being
from - -

THE COURT: Okay. That was a statement by somebody who's not a sworn witness, so I'll sustain the objection.

MR. BERNSTEIN: And the chain of custody of the document, I'm just trying to clarify that. Okay.

THE COURT: The objection was to the statement. I've sustained the objection.

Next question, please.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Unlike the trust, how many originals of a will do you have the client sign?
A. There's only one.
Q. And then you give the client the one with the typewritten -- you call it conformed copy?
A. We conform the copy of the will.
Q. And after Simon died, was your law firm counsel for the personal representative of the Estate of Simon Bernstein?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. Did you file the original will with the court?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Is it your belief that the original of this document is somewhere in the Palm Beach County Court
system with the clerk's office?
A. Yes, I do.

MR. ROSE: I'd move Exhibit 4 in evidence,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection?
[No response.]
MR. BERNSTEIN: No objection stated, I'll receive this as Plaintiff's 4.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 4 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, if you turn to the next to the last page of Exhibit --
A. Yes.
Q. -- Exhibit 4, you'll see it bears a signature of Simon Bernstein and two witnesses, yourself and Kimberly Moran, who all assert that you signed in the presence of each other?
A. Yes.
Q. And then in the next page, it has what would be a self-proving affidavit?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, if you look at the signature block where the notary signed, where it says "who is personally known to me," it doesn't seem to have a check box there.

It just says "who is personally known to me or who has produced [blank] as identification," right?
A. Correct.
Q. Is this the same person who notarized the exhibit we just put in evidence, Exhibit 15, the durable power of attorney -- 16, the durable power of attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And again, with regard to Exhibit 4-- strike that.

Do you recall where you signed Exhibit 4?
A. Yes.
Q. In whose office?
A. This was also done in Si's office.
Q. Okay. So you took -- you went personally again, along with Kim Moran, as your practice, to make sure that the documents were signed properly; true?
A. Correct.
Q. And that's important because, if the documents aren't properly signed, they might not be valid and enforceable?
A. That's correct.
Q. And I'm going to hand you Exhibit 5. This is the Simon L. Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement.

Was that signed the same day, at the same
```

time, with the same procedures?

```
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And would this have been signed with three originals?
A. Yes, it would be.

MR. ROSE: I would move Exhibit 5 into
evidence, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]
THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence as Plaintiff's 5.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 5 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, we looked at the history when you did the first set of documents. In the second set, you started in February through July.

Did you have a number of telephone conferences with Simon during that time?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And at least a couple of face-to-face meetings?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Did at any time Simon give you any indication that he was not fully mentally sharp and aware and
acting of his own volition?
A. Nope. He was Si that we had known since 2007.
Q. I'll close with Exhibit 17. This is a letter you sent to Simon Bernstein, enclosing a copy of his conformed will for him.
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And it's dated the 26th, the day after he signed the documents?
A. Correct.
Q. And did you also leave him with two of the originals of his trust?
A. Yes, we did.

MR. ROSE: I move -- did I move 17 in? Or I
will move it in.

THE COURT: Number 7, is it?
MR. ROSE: Seventeen, sir.
THE COURT: Oh, I'm sorry.
Any objection?
[No response.]
THE COURT: All right. Then that's in
evidence as Plaintiff's 17.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 17 was received into evidence.) BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, Simon passed away on September 13, 2012.

Does that sound right?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. I have Exhibit 18 as his death certificate.

MR. ROSE: I'll just move 18 into evidence.
THE COURT: Any objection?
[No response.]
THE COURT: All right. That's in evidence as Plaintiff's 18.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 18 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. So that's the death certificate for Simon Bernstein.

Did you have any further discussions or meetings with Simon after he signed the will and trust in 2012 and before he died?
A. Not that I recall, no.
Q. And you filed a notice of administration, opened an asset, published it in the Palm Beach Daily Review, did what you had to do?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. And you and Mr. Tescher were the personal representatives of the estate?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And you and Mr. Tescher became the successor
trustees of Simon's amended trust after he passed away?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. I guess while he was still alive, he was still the sole trustee of his trust, which was revocable still?
A. Correct.
Q. And then upon his death, at some point, did Ted Bernstein become aware that he was going to become the successor trustee to the Shirley trust?
A. Yes. We had a meeting with Ted.
Q. And that was the first time he learned about the contents of her trust, as far as you know?
A. Correct.
Q. Initially, did anybody object to the documents or the fact that the beneficiaries were supposed to be the 10 grandchildren?
A. No.
Q. When was there first some kind of an objection or a complaint?
A. I can't recall exactly when it happened.
Q. Okay. Did you at some point get a letter from a lawyer at the Tripp Scott firm?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Okay. I think she was asking you about something called the status of something called I View

It Company? Do you recall that?
A. Vaguely.
Q. Did you know what the Iviewit company was before you received a letter from the Tripp Scott lawyer?
A. I'm not sure. I'm not sure. I know today. I can't tell if I'm answering because I know about it today or if I knew about it at that time.
Q. Okay. And did -- was she asking for some documents from you?
A. Is this Ms. Yates?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And did you provide her with certain documents?
A. She had asked for copies of all of Shirley's and Si's estate planning documents.
Q. And did you provide her with all of the documents?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Was one of the documents that you provided her not an accurate copy of what Shirley had executed during her lifetime?
A. That is true.
Q. Okay. And I guess I'll hand you Exhibit 6,
and this -- is Exhibit 6 a document that is not a genuine and valid testamentary document of Shirley Bernstein?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can you explain to the Court why Exhibit 6 was prepared and the circumstances?
A. It was prepared to carry out the intent of Mr. Bernstein in the meeting that he had had with his five children, and perhaps a vague -- or a layman -- a layman can make a mistake reading Shirley's documents and not understand who the intended beneficiaries were or what powers I had. So this document was created.
Q. Is it your belief that under the terms of Shirley's document from -- the ones she actually signed, that Simon had the power to appoint the funds to the ten grandchildren?
A. Yes. We -- we prepared the documents that way, and our planning transmittal letter to him reflected that.
Q. And this document is, I think you said, to explain it to a layperson in simpler fashion?
A. It was created so that the person that, you know, didn't read estate planning documents and prepare estate planning documents for a living -- you know, there was no intent to cut out Pam and Ted's children,
basically.
Q. Now, did you ever file this exhibit in the courthouse?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Did you ever use it for any purpose?
A. No, we did not.
Q. Was it at one point provided to Eliot's counsel?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Now, the fact -- putting aside this document, were any of the other documents that we're talking about in any way altered or changed from the ones that were signed by Shirley or Simon?
A. No, they were not.
Q. Now, after these issues came to light, did Mr. Eliot Bernstein begin to attack you through the internet and through blogging and things like that?
A. He was doing that long before this document came to light.
Q. Okay. What was Eliot doing?
A. His first thing that he did was -- with respect to the courts, was to file an emergency petition to freeze assets and after his brother as successor trustee of his mother's trust had sold the condo.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, can I object to
            this line of questioning for relevance to validity?
            THE COURT: What's the line of questioning
        you're talking about?
            MR. BERNSTEIN: The slander defamation going
            on about me with, you know, what \(I\) do and --
            THE COURT: Well, I wasn't aware there's a
            line of questioning going on. There is a question.
            You've objected to it.
            MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
            THE COURT: What's the objection to that
            question?
            MR. BERNSTEIN: The relevancy to a validity
                hearing.
            THE COURT: Okay. Can I have the court
            reporter read the question back?
            (A portion of the record was read by the
reporter.)

THE COURT: What is the relevance of whether this guy's posting on Facebook that's negative or not?

MR. ROSE: Well, a couple of things, but, primarily, we're just trying to determine whether these documents are valid.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. ROSE: And he is the only one who's saying
they're not valid, so I want to give some explanation as to why he's saying they're not valid, as opposed to --

THE COURT: I don't care why he's saying they're valid or invalid. I'll wait to see what the facts are. So I'll sustain the objection.

MR. ROSE: That's fine.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did Simon Bernstein make any special arrangements, other than -- strike that.

Did Simon or Shirley make any special arrangements, other than the testamentary documents that are admitted into evidence, for special benefits for Eliot Bernstein and his family?
A. No, they did not.
Q. Any special education trusts, other than the -- these five documents? And I believe there was some shares of stock that were put in trust for all ten grandchildren, right?
A. There was no special arrangements made other than the estate planning documents.
Q. After Simon died, did Eliot claim to you that Simon was supposed to have made some special arrangements for him?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Object to the relevancy again.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: Yes, he did.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Did he ever give you an indication how much money he thought he was going to inherent when his father died, or his children would inherent when his father died?
A. Through his subsequent attorney, yes, he did.
Q. And how much money did he indicate he thought there should be?
A. I heard a number from one of his attorneys of 40- to a \$100 million.
Q. Are you aware of any assets that Simon Bernstein had other than what he disclosed to you at the two times that we've looked at in 2007 and again in February of 2012?
A. No, I am not.

MR. ROSE: No further questions, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks.

Is there any cross?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, I have questions as
well.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then, let me have the direct finished. That way, all the
cross-examination can take place without interruption. So everybody make sure you're fitting within the Plaintiff's side of the room's time limitations. We'll strictly obey those. CROSS (ROBERT SPALLINA)

BY MR. MORRISSEY:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Spallina. My name's John Morrissey. I represent four of the adult grandchildren of Simon Bernstein.

And since we're here today about validity, I'm just going to go over, and try to be very brief, concerning the execution of these documents and your knowledge about the execution.

Exhibit 1, which has been entered as the will of Shirley Bernstein, I'd ask you to direct your attention to that document. And I'm looking here at page 7. I ask that you turn to page 7 of Exhibit 1.

Were you a witness of this document, this will that was executed by Shirley Bernstein on May \(20 t h\) of 2008?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And was Diana Banks the other witness?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. And did you and Diana witness Mrs. Bernstein's execution of this document?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. You were present during her execution?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And was she present during your execution of this document as a witness?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. And was she, Shirley Bernstein, present during Diana Banks' execution of this document?
A. Yes, she was.
Q. Okay. And I'm again focused on this Exhibit No. 1, this will of Shirley Bernstein dated May 20th of 2008 .

Is it your opinion that at the time Shirley Bernstein executed this document she understood generally the nature and extent of her property?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And at the time Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit 1, did she have a general understanding of those who would be the natural objects of her bounty?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And at the time she -- Shirley

Bernstein executed Exhibit 1, did she have a general understanding of the practical effect of this will?
A. I believe she did.
Q. Okay. And in your opinion, was Shirley

Bernstein unduly influenced by any beneficiary of Exhibit 1 in connection with its execution?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge of any beneficiary or anyone actively procuring Exhibit 1?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Okay. Moving on to Exhibit 2, which is Shirley Bernstein's trust executed on the same date, that is May 20th of 2008, I'll direct your attention to page 27 of Exhibit No. 2. And it appears that Shirley Bernstein executed that document on May \(20 t h\) of 2008. And the witnesses were yourself and Traci -- I can't read her last name.
A. Traci Kratish.
Q. Okay. Did Shirley Bernstein execute Exhibit No. 2 in the presence of both you and Traci Kratish?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And did you execute Exhibit No. 2 in the presence of Shirley Bernstein and Traci Kratish?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And did Traci Kratish execute Exhibit No. 2 in your presence and Shirley Bernstein's presence?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And at the time Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 2, which is her 2008 trust, is it your opinion that she had a general understanding of the nature and extent of her property?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And at the time that Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 2, is it your opinion that she understood generally the relationship of those who would -- were the natural objects of her bounty?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And at the time Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 2, is it your opinion that she generally understood the practical effect of this document?
A. I believe she did.
Q. Okay. And did you have any belief that Shirley Bernstein was unduly influenced in connection with -- by any beneficiary in connection with her execution of Exhibit No. 2?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. And do you know or have any information about any beneficiary or anyone else actively procuring Exhibit No. 2?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. And with respect -- now we'll move on
to Exhibit No. 3, which is the first amendment of Shirley Bernstein's trust, executed on November 18th of 2008. And I'll direct your attention on that Exhibit 3 to Page No. 2. And on Page No. 2 --

Well, let me ask this question. Did Shirley Bernstein execute Exhibit No. 3 in the presence of both you and Rachel Walker?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And did you execute Exhibit No. 3 in the presence of Shirley Bernstein and Rachel Walker?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And did Rachel Walker execute this document, Exhibit No. 3, in the presence of Shirley Bernstein and yourself?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And at the time Exhibit No. 3 was executed, is it your opinion that Ms. Bernstein understood generally the nature and extent of her property?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. And is it your opinion that at the time Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 3, she generally understood the relationship of those who would be the natural objects of her bounty?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. And at the time Shirley Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 3, is it your opinion that she generally understood the practical effect of this trust amendment?
A. Yes, I believe so.
Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge or information about any beneficiary or any other person unduly influencing Shirley Bernstein to execute Exhibit No. 3?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge or information about any person, beneficiary or otherwise, actively procuring Exhibit No. 3?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Moving on to Exhibit No. 4 then, which is the will of Simon Bernstein, and that is a will that Mr. Bernstein executed on July -- yes, July 25 of 2012. And let me direct your attention to page 7 of that will, Exhibit No. 4.

And did Simon Bernstein execute this document in the presence of you and Kimberly Moran on July 25, 2012?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And did you execute this document, Exhibit No. 4, as a witness in the presence of simon

Bernstein and Kimberly Moran on that date?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And did Kimberly Moran execute Exhibit No. 4 as a witness in the presence of Simon Bernstein and yourself?
A. Yes, she did.
Q. Okay. And on this date -- or at the time of execution on this date of July 25, 2012, did Simon Bernstein understand in a general way the nature and extent of his property?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Okay. At the time that Exhibit No. 4 was executed, did Simon Bernstein generally understand the relationship of those who would be the natural objects of his bounty?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And at the time Exhibit No. 4 was executed, did -- in your opinion, did Simon Bernstein understand the practical effect of this will?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge or information about any person, whether beneficiary or otherwise, actively procuring this Exhibit No. 4?
A. No, I do not.
Q. Do you have any information about any person,
beneficiary or otherwise, unduly influencing Simon Bernstein to execute Exhibit No. 4?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. And moving on to the last document then, Exhibit No. 5, which is the Simon Bernstein Amended and Restated Trust Agreement, and I'll direct your attention to page 24 of that Exhibit No. 5.

On July 25, 2012, did Simon Bernstein execute this trust agreement in the presence of you and Kimberly Moran?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And did you execute this trust, Exhibit No. 5, as a witness in front of Simon Bernstein and Kimberly Moran?
A. I did.
Q. And did Kimberly Moran execute Exhibit No. 5 as a witness in front of Simon Bernstein and yourself?
A. She did.
Q. Okay. And at the time Simon Bernstein executed Exhibit No. 5, in your opinion, did he generally understand the nature and extent of his property?
A. He did.
Q. And at the time Exhibit No. 5 was executed, did Simon Bernstein, in your opinion, generally
understand the relationship of those who would be the natural objects of his bounty?
A. He did.
Q. And did Simon Bernstein, when Exhibit No. 5 was executed, understand generally the practical effect of this trust agreement?
A. Yes, he did.
Q. And at the time Exhibit No. 5 was executed, do you have any knowledge about any person, whether beneficiary or otherwise, unduly influencing

Mr. Bernstein, Simon Bernstein, to execute this Exhibit No. 5?
A. Nothing that I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. And do you have any knowledge or information about any person, whether beneficiary or otherwise, actively procuring Exhibit No. 5?
A. I do not.

MR. MORRISSEY: I have no further questions, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
Now, is there any cross? You're not required
to ask any questions, but you just need to let me know if you're going to.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, are you asking me? I had no idea.

THE COURT: I'm not asking you. I'm just telling you, if you have questions for the witness, this is your opportunity to ask them; if you don't have any questions, you don't have to ask any. But if you're going to, you have to start now. CROSS (ROBERT SPALLINA)

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Spallina, you were called today to provide some expert testimony, correct, on the --
A. No, I was not.
Q. Oh, okay. You're just going based on your doing the work as Simon Bernstein's attorney and Shirley Bernstein's attorney?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Are you still an attorney today?
A. I am not practicing.
Q. Can you give us the circumstances regarding that?
A. I withdrew from my firm.
Q. Are you under a consent order with the SEC?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you sign a consent order for insider trading --
A. Yes, I did.
Q. -- with the SEC?

You did. Can you give us the circumstances of your consent order?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: That won't be relevant. Please move on to the next question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Were you -- did you plead to a felony crime?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's relevant as to --
THE COURT: I didn't ask for argument.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, what did you say?
THE COURT: I didn't ask for argument. I
sustained the objection -- no, I sustained the last
objection. This one I'm overruling.
You can answer.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I can't ask him if he's a felon?

THE COURT: You're asking the wrong guy.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Are --
THE COURT: The witness is -- you asked the question.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you a convicted felony?

THE COURT: Let's back up a second.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: When you're asking for a ruling, and I make one, then we're going to have the witness answer.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I made my ruling. I'm letting the witness answer your earlier question, unless you're withdrawing it. Are you withdrawing your earlier question?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: You can answer the question, which is, did you plead to a felony?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sorry, sir.

THE WITNESS: I have not.

THE COURT: Okay. Next question.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Have you pled guilty to a misdemeanor?
A. I have not.
Q. Were you involved in a insider trading case?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained. Next question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Does that mean he doesn't have
        to answer that?

THE COURT: How many times have you been in court?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Just a few where I've had to do this.

THE COURT: You know how this works.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I really don't.

THE COURT: All right. If I sustain an objection, that's means he does not answer the question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. And overruled?

THE COURT: If I overrule an objection, that means the witness does answer the question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: And I've asked you to ask your next question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that your picture on the Florida Law Review, SEC case settled against Florida attorneys?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Do you have any questions on the issues that I have to decide in this case?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, his testimony is based
on his truthfulness.

THE COURT: My question is, do you have any questions you want to ask about the issues relevant to this case?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes. This is relevant to this case.

THE COURT: I disagree.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: I thought I made that very clear in my ruling. You probably want to move on to a relevant issue.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Spallina, have you been in discussion with the Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office regarding the Bernstein matters?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And did you state to them that you fraudulently altered a Shirley trust document and then sent it through the mail to Christine Yates?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Have you been charged with that by the Palm Beach County Sheriff yet?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Okay. How many times were you interviewed by the Palm Beach County Sheriff?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you mail a fraudulently signed document to Christine Yates, the attorney for Eliot Bernstein's minor children?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And when did you acknowledge that to the courts or anybody else? When's the first time you came about and acknowledged that you had committed a fraud?
A. I don't know that I did do that.
Q. Well, you just said you went to the Palm Beach County Sheriff and admitted altering a document and put it in the mail.

THE COURT: Let me stop you there. If you want to ask the witness questions, you're permitted to do that. If you would like to argue with the
witness, that's not -- do you have any questions you want to ask?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So you sent a fraudulent document to Eli Bernstein's minor children's counsel.

Can you tell us what that document did to affect the dispositive Shirley trust document?
A. It has no effect.
Q. What was its intended effect of altering the document?
A. To carry out your father's wishes in the agreement that he had made with the five of you for a layperson that would be reading the documents.
Q. You were carrying out his wishes by fraudulently altering a document?

MR. ROSE: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

That's argumentative. I don't want you to argue with the witness. That's an argument.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did the fraudulently altered document change the beneficiaries that were listed in Shirley's trust?
A. They did not.
Q. Who are the beneficiaries of Shirley's trust?
A. It depends on -- under the trust instrument, in the absence of si exercising his power of appointment, it would be yourself and your two sisters, Lisa and Jill.
Q. Oh. So the only beneficiaries in Shirley's trust are me, Lisa and Jill.

Is that directly or through a family trust?
A. Your father had established -- your parents had established family trusts for the three of you to receive assets from the trust.
Q. Okay. So in that document that you sent to Christine Yates, did you include Ted and Pam's lineal descendants under the amendment that you fraudulently drafted and sent to her?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did in any way the document that you fraudulently altered and sent to Yates change the beneficiaries from Eliot, Lisa and Jill and their lineal descendants to anybody else?

THE COURT: May I ask a question?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: This document that you're
referring to, is anybody asking me to probate that document?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's part of the estate plan. It's part --

THE COURT: Is anybody seeking relief, either you or the other side, under that document?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. They're seeking to change the beneficiaries of my mom's trust through that document and others.

THE COURT: You're misperceiving my question.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay. Sorry.
THE COURT: That document, which
is -- nobody's put it in evidence; \(I\) don't know what it is, but it's -- that thing that you're asking the witness about, is somebody seeking relief based upon that document?

MR. ROSE: Absolutely not. The opposite.
THE COURT: All right. Are you seeking relief based upon that document?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. Oh, absolutely.
THE COURT: All right. Are you claiming that that document is subject to probate?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

THE COURT: Is the lady who's giving you advice your attorney?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: Ma'am, are you admitted to the bar in Florida? Remember what \(I\) told you earlier. I've let you sit there as a courtesy. Generally, I don't let wives or friends or anybody else sit at the table where the parties are because it confuses me. But you're giving that guy advice and you're also not listening to me, which I find odd, because I'm going to have you move you back to the gallery now. Please have a seat in the gallery. Please have a seat in the gallery. Please have a seat in the gallery. Soon. When courtesy is not returned, courtesy is withdrawn. Please have a seat in the gallery. Thank you.

Do you have any other questions of the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I submit this as evidence to the Court?

THE COURT: Is that the document you've been asking the witness about?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection to it being received as an exhibit?

MR. ROSE: I don't have any objection to it being received as an exhibit. But as Your Honor
noted, we aren't seeking to probate it, and we're not suggesting it's valid in the first place.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me see what that document is, so then I'll see if I can make some sense out of it.

You can't -- Gary's always afraid that if somebody's not a member of the bar, they might do something bad to me. Officers of the court aren't allowed to do things bad to the judge. Other folks don't know that. And so Gary watches out carefully for my well-being.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Gotcha.

THE COURT: Okay. So this is a document that's titled "First Amendment to Shirley Bernstein Trust Agreement."

MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: And it's in the book that I've been given earlier by the plaintiff as Tab 6. You're seeking to put it into evidence as Defendant's 1?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Right?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Sure. Yes, sir.
THE COURT: You're offering it as an exhibit?
MR. BERNSTEIN: No, Evidence 1.

THE COURT: The objection to it is that it's not relevant?

MR. ROSE: Not relevant. Right, relevance. And it's also not something we're seeking to be probated or treated as authentic and genuine.

THE COURT: Well, the other side is seeking to use the terms of this document instead of the terms of the amendment that's in evidence, right?

MR. ROSE: I don't believe that's what he's doing.

THE COURT: I'm not sure what he's doing, but in an abundance of caution, I'm going to receive it for what relevance it might have. I don't perceive any yet, but we'll see what happens.

So this is Defendant 1.
(Defendant's Exhibit No. 1 was received into evidence.)

THE COURT: Any other questions of the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sure.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You've testified here about Kimberly Moran.

Can you describe your relationship with her?
A. She's been our long-time assistant in the office.
Q. Was she convicted of felony fraudulent notarization in the Estate of Shirley Bernstein?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.

You're asking if she was convicted of a felony
with respect to the Estate of Shirley Bernstein?
You can answer the question.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE WITNESS: I believe she was.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And what was she convicted for?
A. She had notarized the waiver releases of accounting that you and your siblings had previously provided, and we filed those with the court.
Q. We filed those with the court.

Your law firm submitted fraudulent documents to the court?
A. No. We filed -- we filed your original documents with the court that were not notarized, and the court had sent them back.
Q. And then what happened?
A. And then Kimberly forged the signatures and notarized those signatures and sent them back.

Judge Colon has a rule in his court to have those documents notarized, even though that's not the
requirement under the Florida Probate Code.
Q. So when you didn't follow the rule, you frauded [sic] and forged the document?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
THE WITNESS: I had nothing to do with that.
THE COURT: You've got to stop a second.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: If you continue to argue with the witness, then I'll assume you don't have any more questions. I sustained that last objection to argumentative.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm a little confused --
THE COURT: I'm sorry about your confusion, but there are ways you could have dealt with that before this trial. If you are confused during the trial, you better get unconfused as quickly as you can because bad things will happen. And I don't want bad things to happen. I want to get the facts so that I can accurately decide the case on its merits.

Stop arguing, ask questions, let the witness answer, and listen to any rulings that I make on the objections. That's the last time I'll repeat that advice to you. Thank you.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. What law firm submitted those documents to the court?
A. Tescher \& Spallina, P.A.
Q. Are you a partner in that firm?
A. I was.
Q. So your firm that you were a partner with sent in documents that were fraudulent to the court?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did Tescher \& Spallina law firm submit

Kimberly Moran's forged and fraudulent document waivers to the court?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: He already said he did.

MR. BERNSTEIN: What is that?

THE COURT: Cumulative means you've already
had that answer given.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, I didn't have that.

THE COURT: He's already said that he did.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm asking if they deposited
them with the court.

THE COURT: And he said they didn't.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I asked him, and he
said - -

THE COURT: I won't argue with you. Do you want to go on to the next item or not?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. Next question, please.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did your office -- did you submit documents to close the estate of Shirley with Simon as the personal representative at a time Simon was dead?
A. We did.
Q. You did? Excuse me? I didn't hear an answer.
A. I said yes.
Q. So Shirley's estate was closed by a dead personal representative.

Can you give me the time that the estate was closed by simon while he was dead?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer.
THE WITNESS: I believe it was October,

November 2012.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Do you want to check your records on that?
A. I believe it was after his death. I know he died September 13, 2012. And we had received late from
one of your sisters the signed waiver. So it was probably in November, somewhere around there.
Q. You stated that Simon -- that Kimberly did five waivers for the siblings that she sent back in fraudulently to the court through your law firm.

Did she also do a fraudulent forged signature of a waiver for Simon?
A. I'm not sure. I guess if you're saying she did --
Q. Well, the court has on file a waiver of Simon's that she's admitted to.
A. We filed all of the waivers originally with the court all signed by the appropriate parties, and the court kicked those back. And she forged and notarized new documents and sent them to the court. She felt she had made a mistake.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of an April 9th full waiver that was allegedly signed by Simon and you?
A. Yeah. That was the waiver that he had signed. And then in the May meeting, we discussed the five of you, all the children, getting back the waivers of the accountings.
Q. Okay. And in that April 9th full waiver you used to close my mother's estate, does Simon state that he has all the waivers from all of the parties?
A. He does. We sent out -- he signed that, and we sent out the waivers to all of you.
Q. Okay. So on April 9th of 2012, Simon signed, with your presence, because your signature's on the document, a document stating he had all the waivers in his possession from all of his children.

Had you sent the waivers out yet as of April 9th?

THE COURT: What is it that you want the witness to answer? There was several questions.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, compounded a little bit?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sorry.
THE COURT: So you even --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll kick that back.

THE COURT: So you even know the lingo of the objections.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll kick that back to one at a time, because it's an important point.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. April 9th, 2012, you have a signed full waiver of Simon's that says that he is in possession of all of the signed waivers of all of the parties?
A. Standard operating procedure, to have him sign, and then to send out the documents to the kids.
Q. Was Simon in possession -- because it's a sworn statement of Simon saying, I have possession of these waivers of my children on today, April 9th, correct, the day you two signed that?

Okay. So if you hadn't sent out the waivers yet to the --
A. I'm not certain when the waivers were sent out.
Q. Were they sent out after the --
A. I did not send them out.
Q. Okay. More importantly, when did you receive those? Was it before April 9th or on April 9th?
A. We didn't receive the first one until May. And it was your waiver that we received.
Q. So how did you allow Simon, as his attorney, to sign a sworn statement saying he had possession of all of the waivers in April if you didn't get mine 'til May?

MR. ROSE: Objection. I think it's relevance
and cumulative. He's already answered.
THE COURT: What's the relevance?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, this is very relevant.
THE COURT: What is the relevance on the issue that I have to rule on today?

MR. BERNSTEIN: On the validity? Well, it's
relevant. If any of these documents are relevant, this is important if it's a fraud.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Can I -- okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. When did you get -- did you get back prior to Simon's death all the waivers from all the children?
A. No, we did not.
Q. So in Simon's April 9th document where he says, he, Simon, on April 9th has all the waivers from his children while he's alive, and you didn't even get one 'til after he passed from one of his children, how could that be a true statement?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

Here's what I'm going to decide at the end of the day; I'm going to decide whether Shirley's 2008 will and trust and 2008 amendment are valid and enforceable. I'm going to decide whether Simon's 2012 will and 2012 trust documents are valid and enforceable. You have a lot more on your mind than I have on mine. You do. Right? But those are the things that I'm working on. So I'm focused like a laser and you're focused more like a shotgun. I'm telling you this so that you can focus more tightly
on the questions you're asking and the facts you're developing so they'll help me make an accurate decision on those things that I'm going to decide today. You can keep asking questions that don't go anywhere, but I would hope that you'll adjust your approach so that you'll help me make an accurate decision.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And on validity, let's just get right to that real quick. You've testified to a lot of documents here today, correct, of the estate documents you drafted, correct?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did you gain any pecuniary interest, did you gain any titles in those documents?
A. Pecuniary interest? No. I was named by your father as personal representative and trustee of his trust.
Q. And so you executed -- you drafted the documents, you signed them as a witness, and you gained interest in the documents, correct?
A. No, I did not.
Q. You didn't gain interest as a trustee -MR. ROSE: Objection.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. -- or a personal representative of those documents?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative. Asked and answered.

THE COURT: Overruled.

THE WITNESS: I was named as his personal representative and trustee, along with my partner. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you witness the document?
A. I did.
Q. Did you draft the document?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. You mentioned there was Kimberly Moran there at the signing of these documents, correct?
A. She was.
Q. Okay. Can you point her out, because I'm going to need her to testify as to the validity?
A. I do not see her in the courtroom.
Q. Okay. You mentioned a Traci Kratish. Can you point her out in the courtroom today to validate the documents?
A. I don't see Traci in the room either.
Q. So she was another witness that is not here present to validate the documents today? Well, it's
awful -- okay.
Is Kimberly Moran here who notarized the documents.

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative. Asked that a minute ago.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I didn't -- did I? Was it

Moran --

THE COURT: No, I thought it was some other name.

MR. BERNSTEIN: So did I.
THE COURT: Is Kimberly here?
THE WITNESS: She's not.

THE COURT: Okay. Next question.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Being a former estate planning attorney. To validate a document, wouldn't you have the parties who witnessed and notarized and signed present?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
Misstates --
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is it necessary to validate documents with the necessary notaries and witnesses present?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Calls for a legal
conclusion.

THE COURT: Well, I'm the one that's going make that decision. I don't care what the witness says about the law.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I gotcha. Okay.
THE COURT: So this would be a good time for us to take a pause. We're not making headway.

You ever here of cavitation when it comes to boat propellers?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Okay. I don't know a lot about the physics of it, but a boat goes forward based on a propeller spinning in the water. And it happens sometimes in racing boats, maybe other boats too, that you get the propeller going so fast or you do something so much with the propeller that it cavitates, which means that it's not actually pushing in the water. It's making a lot of noise. It's spinning like crazy. It's furiously working, but it's not propelling the boat forward. I want to suggest to you that you've hit a point of cavitation. So this would be a good time for us to take our lunch break so that when we get back we'll go forward with this ship that is our trial.

MR. BERNSTEIN: How long?
THE COURT: It'll be until 1:30.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: That'll give everybody a time to revive, if necessary, and we'll reconstitute ourselves at 1:30. Thanks.
(A break was taken.)
(Proceedings continued in Volume 2.)
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PROCEEDINGS
(Proceedings continued from Volume 1.)

THE COURT: We're ready to resume. Our witness is still under oath.

Is there any further cross-examination?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

CROSS (ROBERT SPALLINA) (Cont'd)

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Spallina, just to clarify --

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, can he just stand at the podium?

THE COURT: Okay. Well, use the podium. Your microphone will help explain your questions. But you can walk up there. If you need to show the witness a document or something, that's fine.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you -- are you a member of the Florida Bar?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Currently?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. You said before you surrendered your
license.
A. I said I withdrew from my firm. It wasn't that I was not practicing.
Q. Okay. In the chain of custody of these documents, you stated that there were three copies made?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have those three original trust copies here?
A. I do not.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Does anybody?
THE COURT: Do you have any other questions of the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. I wanted to ask him
some questions on the original documents.

THE COURT: Okay. Keep going.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. So the original documents aren't in the court?
A. I don't have them.
Q. Your firm is not in possession of any of the original documents?
A. I'm not sure. I'm not at the firm anymore.
Q. When you left the firm, were there documents still at the firm?
A. Yes, there were.
Q. Were you ordered by the court to turn those documents over to the curator, Benjamin Brown?
A. I don't recall.

MR. ROSE: Objection. Can he clarify the question, which documents? Because I believe the curator was for the estate, and the original will was already in file, and the curator would have no interest in the trust --

THE COURT: Which documents? When you say "those documents," which ones are you referring to?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Any of the trusts and estate documents.

THE COURT: Okay. That's been clarified.

You can answer, if you can.
THE WITNESS: I believe that he was given -- I believe all the documents were copied by Mr. Pollock's office, and that he was given some type of zip drive with everything. I'm not sure, though. I couldn't --

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did the zip drive contain the original documents?
A. Did not. I believe the original documents came back to our office. Having said that, we would only have -- when we made and had the client execute
three documents, two originals of those documents would remain with the client, and then we would keep one original in our file, except -- including, most of the time, the original will, which we put in our safe deposit box. So we would have one original of every document that they had executed, including the original will, and they would keep two originals of everything, except for the will, which we would give them conformed copies of, because there was only one original will.
Q. Okay. I asked a specific question. Did your firm, after the court order of Martin Colin, retain documents, original documents?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Sorry. I should have
let him finish.

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- original documents?
THE WITNESS: I believe --
MR. ROSE: Relevance and misstates the --
there's no such order.
THE COURT: Well, the question is, Did your
firm retain the original documents?
Is that the question?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: Overruled.

Answer, please.
THE WITNESS: I believe we had original
documents.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. After the date you were court ordered to produce them to the curator?

MR. ROSE: Object -- that's the part I object to.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. To your knowledge -- so, to your knowledge, the documents can't all be here since they may be at your firm today?
A. I don't practice at the firm anymore, so I'm not sure where the documents are.
Q. Okay. And you said you made copies of all the documents that you turned over to the curator? Did you turn over any original documents as ordered by the court?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Same objection. There's no court order requiring an original document be turned over.

THE COURT: What order are you referring to?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Judge Colin ordered when they resigned due to the fraudulent alteration of the documents that they turn over --

THE COURT: I just said, what order are you referring to?

MR. BERNSTEIN: It's an order Judge Colin ordered.

THE COURT: All right. Well, produce that order so I can see it, because Judge Colton's [sic] been retired for six or seven years.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I don't have it with me, but...

THE COURT: Well, Judge Colton's a retired judge. He may have served in some other capacity, but he doesn't enter orders, unless he's sitting as a replacement judge. And that's why I'll need to see the order you're talking about, so I'll know if he's doing that. Okay. Thanks. Next question. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Has anyone, to the best of your knowledge, seen the originals while you were in custody of them?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Who?
A. I believe Ken Pollock's firm was -- Ken Pollock's firm was the firm that took the documents for purposes of copying them.
Q. Did anybody ask you, refer copies to inspect
the documents?
A. Other than Ken Pollock's office, I don't recall.
Q. Did I ask you?
A. Perhaps you did.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'd like to go through some of the documents with him real quick. But I don't have my wife to hand me the documents, so it's going to take me incredibly long. These are just copies I have. Can I approach him?

THE COURT: All approaches are okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are these the documents that you drafted, Shirley's will and Shirley's trust agreement?

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, could I see what he's handing the witness before he hands it to them?

THE COURT: Say again.
MR. ROSE: I don't know what he's handing the witness.

THE COURT: All right. You'll need to show the other side the documents that you're handing to the witness so that they're looking at the same thing you're talking about.

MR. ROSE: These are not accurate. These are
multiple things stapled together. I'd object to the exhibit -- or the use of it.

THE COURT: Ma'am, if you come back up past that bar one more time, you'll be in contempt of court. I don't want you to be in contempt of court. Do you understand my instruction?

MRS. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Thank you.
MR. ROSE: I don't know if that's filed with the court and I don't know that these are genuine. And the second document has attached to it --

THE COURT: Well, you don't need to tell me what the papers are. The thing that the person who's asking the questions has to do is show you the documents that he's going to show the witness.

MR. ROSE: Okay.
THE COURT: Then I intend to move forward. I expect he'll show the witness the documents and then he'll probably ask a question.

Am I right?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Do you want to see those?
THE COURT: Nope.
So then if there's an objection to the documents coming in, if at some time they're proffered as an exhibit, then I'll take the
objection.
Have you seen the documents that are in his hand that are going to be shown to the witness?

MR. ROSE: Oh, yes, sir. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.
Proceed.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Can you look at the initials on the pages of that document and describe them -- describe what they look like?
A. The initials?
Q. Yes.
A. On each page, there's an SB --
Q. Okay.
A. -- for your mother's initials.
Q. And it's clearly SB?
A. Is it clearly SB ?
Q. Yeah. Looks like SB?
A. Yes, it's clearly SB.
Q. Okay. And on this will signed on the same date by my mother in your presence, is that my mom's initials? And does it look like an SB? Do they even look similar?
A. Well, your mother was asked to sign these documents.
Q. Okay.
A. When we execute a will, unlike the bottom of the trust agreement where we initial the trust pages, on the bottom of the will, she's supposed to sign her signature. And which she has done at the bottom of each page, is sign her signature consistent with the signature page that she signed.
Q. So what you're saying is, she signed this document, that she initialed this document?
A. Right. We only ask that for purposes of the trust that they initial each page. For purposes of the will, that they sign each page.

So this is the signature that she has -- this is her signature on the bottom of this document.
Q. Well, there's no line saying that's her signature, correct? There would be --
A. But that was our practice.
Q. Okay.
A. That was our practice, to have --
Q. Okay. You testified to my dad's state of mind that he was fine.

Si was usual when you saw him from May through his death; is that correct?
A. Are you speaking about 2012?
Q. Yes.
A. Correct.
Q. Are you aware of any medical problems my
father was having at that time?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Are you aware of any stress he was under?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Mr. Rose had you read into or -- read into the record a letter that \(I\) wrote with my waiver, saying, anything -- I haven't seen the dispositive documents, but I'll do anything, 'cause my dad is under stress, to relieve him of his stress.

Do you know what stress \(I\) was referring to?
A. I don't.
Q. Were you in the May meeting with my father, May 10, 2012?
A. I was -- are you talking about on the telephone call?
Q. Correct.
A. I wasn't together with him.
Q. Okay. Were you together with anybody on that call?
A. No. I was on -- in my -- my office phone.
Q. Okay. And at that meeting, did Si state that he was having this meeting to end disputes among certain parties and himself?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Were there any disputes you were aware of?
A. The only thing that he ever brought to my attention was the letter that Pam had sent him.
Q. And what did Pam's letter state, basically?
A. I can't remember it. I mean, it was the letter that he showed me in February of 2012. But the general gist of that letter was that she was unhappy about not being part of their estates.
Q. Just her or her and her children?
A. She may have spoke to her children.
Q. Was there anybody else who was left out of the wills and trusts?
A. That was causing him stress?
Q. No. Just anybody at this point that was left out, other than Pam.
A. Yes. Ted.
Q. And are you aware of anything Ted and Pam were doing to force upon Si changes?
A. Not to my knowledge, other than the letter that Pam had sent to him just expressing her dissatisfaction.
Q. You said you talked to her attorney?
A. I talked to her attorney.
Q. And you told her attorney, while Si was
living, that she had been cut out of the estates and trusts with her brother Ted?
A. I don't recall the conversation with the attorney, but, ultimately, Si gave me authorization to send documents to the attorney. So we may have had a conversation about it.
Q. So you're stating that si told you to -- he authorized you to tell his daughter that she had been cut out of the estates and trusts?
A. He authorized me to send documents to the attorney.
Q. Did you send those documents to the attorney?
A. I believe we did, yes.
Q. Okay. Was Ted and his lineal descendants disinherited?
A. They were, under the original documents.
Q. Well, under Shirley's document that's currently theirs, Ted considered predeceased for all purposes of disposition according to the language in the document you drafted?
A. To the extent that assets passed to him under the trust.
Q. Well, the document says, for all purposes of disposition, Ted Bernstein is considered predeceased, correct?
A. You'll have to state the question again.
Q. Does the document you drafted say that Ted Bernstein is both considered predeceased under the beneficiary definition with his lineal descendants and considered predeceased for all purposes of dispositions of the trust?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Best evidence. The document's in evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll have him read it.
THE COURT: Well, I mean, I can read it. It's in evidence. So when it comes time, just point me to the part that you want me to read, and I'll read it. But I don't need to have the witness read it to me. That's of no benefit.

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, and for the record, those issues are part of the other counts and aren't being tried today.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Page 7, Your Honor, of the Shirley trust.

THE COURT: What exhibit number is that?
MR. BERNSTEIN: You want me to enter it as my exhibit?

THE WITNESS: Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me go to page 7 of Plaintiff's 2.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can \(I\) enter this one into the record?

THE COURT: Is it the same as the one I already have?

MR. BERNSTEIN: According to Alan, it's not.
THE COURT: According to who?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Mr. Rose.
THE COURT: All right. Well, if it comes time for you to put any exhibits in on your case, if that's not a duplicate of an exhibit that's already in, you're welcome to put it into evidence. But this is not the time when you put evidence in. This is the time when you're cross-examining the plaintiff's witness.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: So on Page 7 of Plaintiff's 2, you can go on with your questioning.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you there and are we on the same page?

Yes?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Okay. In the definition of -- under E1, do you see where it starts "notwithstanding the foregoing"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can you read that?
A. "Notwithstanding the foregoing, as I have adequately provided for them during my lifetime, for purposes of the dispositions made under this trust to my children, Ted S. Bernstein and Pamela B. Simon and their respective lineal descendants shall be deemed to have predeceased the survivor of my spouse and me, provided, however, if my children Eliot Bernstein, Jill Iantoni and" - -
Q. Okay, that's -- you can stop there.

Would you consider making distributions a disposition under the trust?
A. It would it depend on other factors.
Q. What factors?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is a validity hearing a disposition of the trust?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Calls for a legal
conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, he drafted the document,
so I'm trying to get what his meaning was when he
put it in. And it's relevant to the hearing today.
THE COURT: I ruled it's not relevant.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, you did rule that?

THE COURT: Do you have another question of the witness? Or we're moving on.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So for purposes of disposition, Ted, Pam and her lineal descendants are considered predeceased, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy, cumulative and best evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.
The document says what it says.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: When you ask a witness if it says what it says, I don't pay any attention to his answer, because I'm reading what it says.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you produce a fraudulent copy of the Shirley trust agreement?
A. No, I did not.
Q. So when you sent to Christine Yates this trust agreement with the attached amendment that you've
already admitted you fraudulently altered, was that producing a not valid copy of the trust that was distributed to a party?
A. We've already talked about the amendment was not a valid amendment.
Q. No, I'm asking, did you create a not valid trust of my mother's and distribute it to Christine Yates, my children's attorney?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative. He's covered this.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it has to go to the validity, Your Honor, because --

THE COURT: The question I'm figuring out is, have we already covered this?

MR. BERNSTEIN: We touched on a piece of it. The more important part --

THE COURT: Okay. Then I'll let you reask your question to cover something that we've not already covered.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. And we covered that the --

THE COURT: You don't have to remind me.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: Listen, see, this -- look at this.
I take notes. I write stuff down. Now, a lot of
times, if you see me not writing and I'm doodling, that means you're not scoring any points.

MR. BERNSTEIN: You've got to show me --

THE COURT: The point is, I should be writing notes. So that means you're not doing any good.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Gotcha.

THE COURT: So, please, the reason I write it is so we don't have to repeat things.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. You've already stated that you created a fraudulent amendment.

Did you attach it to a Shirley trust document?
A. No. We included the amendment with the documents that we transmitted to her.
Q. So it was included as part of the Shirley trust document as an amendment, correct?
A. It was included as an amendment.
Q. To the Shirley trust document.

Thereby, you created a fraudulent copy, a not valid copy of the Shirley trust, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer. Did that create a fraudulent version of the trust?

THE WITNESS: It could have, yes, Your Honor. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you explain why it couldn't have?
A. Because Si ultimately exercised his power of appointment, which was broader than the definitional provision in the document.
Q. That's not my question. I'll just say it was asked and not answered.

Okay. So there are not validly -- not valid Shirley trust agreements in circulation, correct?
A. That's not true.
Q. Well, the Shirley trust agreement you said sent to Christine Yates you've just stated was invalidly produced.
A. To Christine Yates.
Q. Yeah, okay. So I said "in circulation."

Is Christine Yates out of circulation?
A. I don't know what Christine Yates did with the documents.
Q. Well, I got a copy, so they're even more in circulation.

So my point being, you sent from your law firm fraudulent -- a non-valid copy of the document --
A. Which document?
Q. -- the Shirley trust and her amendment to

Christine Yates, right?
MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. We'll move on from that.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Would you know about when you did that
fraudulent alteration of the document?
A. January 2013.
Q. And you were a fiduciary -- or you were counsel to the alleged fiduciary, Ted Bernstein, of the Shirley Bernstein trust, correct?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And you were counsel to Ted Bernstein as the alleged personal representative of Shirley's estate?
A. Yes, we were.
Q. And as Ted's counsel in the Shirley trust, can you describe what the not valid trust agreement that was sent to Ms. Yates did to alter the beneficiaries of the document?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Overruled.
What alterations did that make to the
beneficiaries?
THE WITNESS: It didn't make any alterations
to the beneficiaries. The document's not a valid document and so it couldn't have made any changes to the estate planning.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. But what did it intend to do?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sorry. Excuse me, Your Honor. What did you say?

THE COURT: Next question.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. What did it intend to do?
A. I answered that question earlier.

THE COURT: I can't let the witness object to questions. That won't work.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Your Honor. Earlier you asked me the question, and I responded to you that it was to carry out your father's intent and the agreement that you all had made prior to his death, on that telephone call, and to have a document that would provide, perhaps, clarity to a vague misinterpretation of your mother's document. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So instead of going to the court, you just frauded a document to an attorney, who's representing minor children in this case -- produce a fraudulent copy of the trust document, making us have total trouble
understanding what's real and not, especially with your
firm's history of fraudulent and forged documents submitted to the court in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. You're just ranting. Ranting is not allowed.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Sorry.
THE COURT: If you'd like to ask a question, I'll let you do that. If I have to call you on this too many more times, I'm going to assume that you're done questioning the witness.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. When did you first meet my parents?
A. 2007 .
Q. And how did you meet them?
A. I met them through someone that made a referral to them to our office.
Q. You didn't know Ted Bernstein prior to meeting Si?
A. I don't recall who we met first. I'm not sure.
Q. What firm were you with at the time?
A. Tescher, Gutter, Chaves, Josepher, Rubin and Ruffin and Forman.
Q. And how long were you with them?
A. Five-plus years.
Q. And where were you before that?
A. I was in school.
Q. Okay. Did you work at Sony Digital ever?
A. I did.
Q. You did. And when was that, before school or after?
A. That was from 1994 to '96.
Q. So after school?
A. After college.
Q. Okay. So that was -- you just forgot about that one in your history.

Is there any other parts of your biography I'm missing?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you repeat, since I'm -- there was a little clarification error there. Your history, you started --

THE COURT: That's not necessary to repeat the history. Do you have a new question?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm trying to get the history.

THE COURT: I don't want him to repeat what
he's already said. That moves the case backwards.
I want to go forward. You're cavitating.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did the altered trust document sent to Christine Yates attempt to convince Yates and others she sent that document to that Ted and Pam's lineal descendants were actually inside the document?
A. Say the question again.
Q. Well, we read the section where they're considered predeceased, Ted and Pam and their lineal descendants.

When you altered that amendment that you said you were just doing Si's wishes postmortem by altering a document, my question is, did you put language in there that would have made Ted and Pam's lineal descendants now beneficiaries of Shirley's trust?

MR. ROSE: Objection. I think it's
cumulative. We've covered this.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can the beneficiary of Shirley's trust be Ted, Pam or their lineal descendants?
A. If the assets of her trust were to pass under
the trust, no --
Q. Okay.
A. -- under the trust.
Q. So in the trust language of the Shirley trust document, Ted's lineal descendants and Pam's lineal descendants can get no dispositions, distributions, whatever you want to call it?
A. You have to ask the question in a different way, because I answered the question. I said, if it passes under the trust, that they would not inherent. If.
Q. Okay. When Shirley died, was her trust irrevocable at that point?
A. It was.
Q. Who were the beneficiaries?
A. Simon Bernstein.
Q. And who were the beneficiaries -- well, Simon Bernstein wasn't a beneficiary. He was a trustee.
A. No, he became the beneficiary of her trust when she died. He was the sole beneficiary of her trust when she died.
Q. Okay. And then who would it go to when he died?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. When Simon died, who would the benefits of Shirley's trust go to?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Are you asking him to tell you
what would happen if the mother died first, then
the father died second, and we have the trust
documents and the wills that are in place so far
that have been testified to at the trial?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.

THE COURT: I already know all that stuff.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well --

THE COURT: So what is the new question you want to ask that's not cumulative?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Well, I'm trying to get to a very significant point there.

THE COURT: Get there. Just go there and see what happens.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I just have to learn to ask these questions a little more like a lawyer.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERNSTEIN: So I have to rethink how to ask that.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Do you recall talking to Detective Ryan

Miller?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you tell me all the roles you had in these estates and trusts, and your partner, Don Tescher?
A. We were the attorneys to your parents. Upon your dad's death, we became counsel to his estate and served as co-PRs and co-trustees under his documents.
Q. Any other roles?
A. Served as counsel for -- we served as counsel for Ted as fiduciary under your mother's documents.
Q. And who served as your counsel as trustee PR -- co-trustee, co-PR?
A. Mark Manceri.
Q. Mark Manceri submitted that he was your attorney?
A. I believe so, yes.
Q. Did you take a retainer out with him?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: What's the relevance of the
retainer question?

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I take that back.

Mark Manceri was not counsel to us with respect to
the estate, except on a very specific matter.

THE COURT: The question that was objected to was, did you take out a retainer? What's the relevance of that?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm trying to figure out if he was properly representing before the court these documents, and to his credibility, meaning his --

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And a question about the court. How long
before you notified the court as a personal representative fiduciary that you had produced a fraudulent trust of Shirley's?
A. To whom? I don't know that we ever
represented the document to the court, and I don't know that anyone ever came to the court and said that we did.
Q. Well, I did in a petition I filed and served on you --

MR. ROSE: Objection.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. -- of January -- excuse me -- petition that I served on you exposing a fraud of what happened with Christine Yates after you admitted that to the police.

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. How many times have you spoken with Alan Rose in the last three months?
A. Twice.
Q. Did you prepare for this hearing in any way with Alan Rose?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. Was that the two times you spoke to him?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see any other of the parties that would be necessary to validate these trust documents in the court today?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And you gave testimony to the total net worth of Simon today, when you were asked by Mr. Rose; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. How long did you serve as the co-trustee and co-personal representative?
A. Of your father's estate? Since the date of
his death.
Q. And his trust?
A. Same.
Q. Okay. Did you produce an accounting to support those claims you made today?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, can I argue that or --
THE COURT: No.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Not even close. Does that
mean I have to ask it a different way?
THE COURT: Well, I can't answer questions.
I'm not allowed to give anybody legal advice.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. That was procedural, I
thought. But okay.
THE COURT: Well, that's legal advice.
Procedure is a legal issue.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. As a fiduciary of the estate of Simon and the trust of Simon, did your law firm produce a accounting?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's relevant to, if
he's a fiduciary, his conduct. I mean, there's --
THE COURT: Here's the way I handle
objections --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: -- somebody asks a question, and somebody in the courtroom says objection, and then I have them state the legal objection and stop. The other side doesn't say anything, unless I say, Is there any argument one side or the other? Because usually I can figure this stuff out without having to waste time with arguments.

I didn't ask for any argument, right? Okay. Sustained. Next question.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Rose asked you about Shirley's Bentley.

Are you aware -- you became aware of Shirley's Bentley, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. When you became aware of Shirley's Bentley, did you put in an amended inventory to account for it?

THE COURT: What's this going to help me decide on the validity of the wills or trusts?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm just responding to the statements that were brought up.

THE COURT: I wish you would have objected to the relevancy then, but you didn't.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I did.

THE COURT: I don't think so.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No?

THE COURT: I'm a car guy, so I pay attention if somebody's asking questions about Bentleys just because it's interesting.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's so important, Your Honor, because --

THE COURT: No, it's not. Right now what is tied is, are the wills and trusts bound?

MR. BERNSTEIN: We have to question his competency.

THE COURT: And so what's in the estate or what's in the trust is not of any interest to me right now. So if that Bentley should have been in the estate or should not have been in the estate, it should have been accounted for, not accounted for, I'm not going to figure out today. But I want to get all the evidence \(I\) possibly can to see whether these wills and trusts that are in front of me are valid or not valid. And I'm hoping that you'll ask some questions that'll help me figure that out.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Are those originals that you have?

THE COURT: See, I'm not the witness. I'm the judge. So I'm not sworn in and I have no knowledge
of the facts of this case, other than what the witnesses tell me.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm winding down. I'll check my list.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you familiar with a document the Bernstein Family Realty LLC agreement?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Did you draft that document?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Was it part of Simon's estate planning?
A. It was part of his estate planning -- well, yes --
Q. And what was --
A. -- in a roundabout way.
Q. What was it designed to do?
A. It was designed to hold title to the home that you and your family live in.
Q. Oh, okay. And so it was -- who's the owners of that?
A. The three kids -- your three kids, Josh, Daniel -- your three kids' trusts that your father created -- and Jake -- that he created in -- I believe he created those trusts in 2006.
Q. And the prior testimony was, there were no special documents under Simon's estate plan for my family; is that correct?
A. Right. None that we prepared. Those were not documents that we prepared.
Q. Okay. I think he asked you if you knew of any.

So you knew of these, correct?
A. You're making me recall them. Yes.
Q. Oh, okay. Because you answered pretty affirmatively no before, that you weren't aware of any special --

THE COURT: Do you have any questions for the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I get it.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You referenced an insurance policy.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I -- well, I can't ask him anything.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You referenced an insurance policy earlier, life insurance policy, that you said you never saw; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that part of the estate plans?
A. We never did any planning with that. That was an insurance policy that your father had taken out 30 years before. He had created a trust in 1995 for that. That was not a part of any of the planning that we did for him.
Q. Did you file a death benefit claim on behalf of that policy?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is Christine Yates, who you sent the fraudulently altered Shirley trust document that's not valid, a layman?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Excuse me.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is she an attorney at law?

THE COURT: Now you're asking a different
question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Thanks.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is she a layman, as you described prior?
A. She's an attorney.
Q. Okay. So you were sending that document that
you said you altered to make a layman understand the language in the trust better?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Let me have you finish your questioning.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. But you sent it to Christine Yates, an attorney, who's not a layman?
A. We did.
Q. Okay. So it could be that you sent that document to an attorney to commit a fraud upon her clients, my children, minor children, correct?
A. The intent was not to commit a fraud.
Q. Okay.
A. Again, the intent was to carry out your dad's wishes.
Q. By fraudulently altering documents?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
If you ask one more argumentative question, I
will stop you from asking the other things, because
I'll figure that you're done. Is that clear?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: I'm done warning you. I think
that's just too much to have to keep saying over
and over again.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. When Shirley died, were her wishes upheld?
A. Your dad was the sole survivor of her
estate -- he was the sole beneficiary of her estate and her trust.
Q. So her wishes of her trusts when Simon died were to make who the beneficiaries?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Who did Shirley make -- are you familiar with the Eliot Bernstein Family Trust?
A. I am.
Q. And is that trust under the Shirley trust?
A. No, it's not.
Q. It's a separate trust?
A. It is.
Q. Is it mentioned in the Shirley trust?
A. It may be.
Q. As what?
A. As a receptacle for Shirley's estate.
Q. Her trust?
A. A potential receptacle for Shirley's trust.
Q. So there were three, the Eliot Bernstein

Family Trust, Lisa Friedstein and Jill Iantoni Family Trust, that are mentioned as receptacles. I would assume that's the word, beneficiary --

MR. ROSE: Objection.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. -- of the Shirley trust, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. On Simon's medical state eight weeks before he died, when these documents of the Simon trust are alleged by you to have been signed, are you aware of any conditions of Simon's at that time medically?
A. I was not.
Q. Were you aware of any medicines he was on?
A. I was not.
Q. Were you aware he was seeing a psychiatrist?
A. I was not.
Q. Were you aware that he was going for a brain scan?
A. I was not.
Q. Were you aware that he was brought in to multiple doctors during that time for brain problems; that they ended up doing a brain biopsy at Delray Medical right around that time that he's said to sign
these documents?
A. He did not make us aware of any medical issues that he had.
Q. Okay. Did you ask him at the time you were signing those amended documents if he was under any medical stress?
A. No, I did not.
Q. Okay.
A. He --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I ask him to read that?
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you look at that document and --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Judge, would you like a look at this?

THE COURT: I don't look at anything that's not an exhibit.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm exhibiting it to him.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's fine, but I
want you to go ahead and ask your question. I don't look at things that aren't exhibits in evidence --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: -- unless I have to mark them.

But no, I don't have a curiosity to look at pieces of paper.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Should I exhibit it as evidence -- can I exhibit it as --

THE COURT: If it comes into evidence, I'll look at it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Can I submit it as evidence?

THE COURT: Well, have you asked any questions to establish what it is?

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is this a letter from your law firm -- prior law firm?
A. I did not prepare this letter --
Q. Okay.
A. -- but it appears to be, yes.
Q. Prepared by?
A. Donald Tescher.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Now can I submit it?
THE COURT: So you're offering it as an exhibit --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Please.

THE COURT: -- as Defendant's 2.
Is there any objection?
MR. ROSE: No objection.
THE COURT: All right. I'll take a look at
it. And that'll be in evidence as Defendant's 2.

Thank you.
(Defendant's Exhibit No. 2 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Can you just read into the record paragraph 2 --

THE COURT: Well, I'm reading it. The document is in the record.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
THE COURT: I'm reading paragraph 2 even as we speak, so I don't need the witness to read it for me. But if you want to ask him a question, you can go ahead with that.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. That letter states that Si's power of appointment for Simon could not be used in favor of Pam, Ted and their respective children; is that correct?
A. Yes. Don appears to have written that.
Q. Did you get a copy of this letter?
A. I don't recall getting a copy of it, but doesn't mean that I didn't.
Q. But you are partners in that firm?
A. Yes, we were partners in that firm.
Q. Now, that -- this document --

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, can I just -- I don't
want to go out of order, but this is only relevant if the documents are valid. And if he's -- the whole point is the documents are valid. And he wants to argue the second part, of what they mean, then we should not have wasted a whole day arguing over the validity of these five documents.

THE COURT: Well, waste of time is what I do for a living sometimes. Saying we shouldn't be here doesn't help me decide anything.

I thought I was supposed to decide the validity of the five documents that have been pointed out; some of them might be valid and some of them might be invalid. And I'm struggling to decide what's relevant or not relevant based upon the possibility that one of them might be invalid or one of them might not. And so I'm letting in a little bit more stuff than I normally think I would.

MR. ROSE: I'm concerned we're arguing the second -- the second part of this trial is going to be to determine what the documents mean and what Simon's power of attorney could or couldn't do. And this document goes to trial two and not trial one, although I didn't object to its admissibility.

THE COURT: Well, since it's in evidence,
we'll leave it there and see what happens next.
Do you have any other questions of the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. It says that the document that you
fraudulently altered creating the invalid copy of the Shirley trust had some kind of paragraph 2 that was missing from the original document --

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. -- from my understanding.

THE COURT: You may finish your question. And make sure it's a question and not an argument. Because you know what happens if this is an argument.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm not arguing. I'm just asking --

THE COURT: I want you to ask your question. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. It says here that there was a blank spot that you -- a Paragraph No. 2 which modified the definitional language by deleting words.

According to this document, the power of appointment by Simon could not alter the Shirley trust
agreement, correct?
A. Don seems to be suggesting that in the second paragraph. I don't necessarily believe that that's the case.
Q. Did you review this document with Don?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: The question is, Did you go over
this document with Don?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.

THE COURT: Overruled.
You can answer.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So he's -- Don, in this letter, is describing your actions, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you write a letter to anybody describing your actions?
A. I did not.
Q. You did not.

And what have you done to correct the damages caused by that to my family?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. And are you aware of an autopsy that was done on my father the day -- or ordered the day he died?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you aware -- well, are you aware of a heavy metal poison test that was done by the Palm Beach County coroner?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's --

THE COURT: Next question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm trying to figure that out.

Your Honor, is -- I can't ask you that question. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Competency. Based on everything you know about Simon, when he signed those documents, he was competent?
A. To my knowledge, he was of sound mind and body.
Q. Now, are you a medical expert?
A. I'm not.
Q. Are you aware of any other fraudulent activity that took place in anything in the estate and trusts of

Simon Bernstein by yourself or your employees?
A. Are you referring back to the closing of your mother's estate?
Q. I'm referring to any other --
A. -- we've talked about.
Q. So can you list those and then just say that's all that you're aware of?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Other than the fraud that you've admitted to in the documents of Shirley, the Moran forged and fraudulent waivers, the April 9th waiver that you and Si signed stating he had all the waivers when he couldn't have, are there any other frauds that you're aware of that took place with these estate and trust documents?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. When you were first interviewed by the Palm Beach County Sheriff with Kimberly Moran, did you notify them at that first interview that you had fraudulently altered a document?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. When did you notify the sheriff that you
fraudulently altered a document?
MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You have these exhibits. This will says "conformed copy" on Exhibit 1 of their exhibits; is that correct?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Does a conformed copy have to have the clerk of the court's signature on it?
A. Conformed copy would not be sent to the clerk of the courts.
Q. Conformed copy -- okay.

Is that your signature on the document? This is Exhibit 2, Shirley trust agreement, of the plaintiff's exhibit book, 2, page 27.
A. Yes, it appears to be.
Q. It appears to be?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. And is that Traci Kratish's signature?
A. She was there. I can't speak to her signature.
Q. Did you witness her sign it?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. Is that my mom's signature on page 28?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. On this first amendment to Shirley's trust --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Exhibit 3, Your Honor, page 1 of 3, I guess. It's the first page in that exhibit.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that document -- do you recall that document?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you recall the day it's signed and notarized, allegedly?
A. November 18th, 2008.
Q. On the front page of that document, what day is the document dated?
A. It's not dated.
Q. Is that typical and customary in your office?
A. Sometimes clients forget to put the date at the top.
Q. You forget?
A. I said, sometimes clients forget to put the date at the top.
Q. Well, did you check the document before making it a part of a will and trust?
A. It was notarized as a self-proving document.
Q. Are you aware that Kimberly Moran's notarization of the Simon trust has been found by the Governor Rick Scott's notary public division to be deficient?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Hearsay.
THE COURT: Sustained. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you aware of Kimberly Moran of your office being contacted by the governor's office in relation to these wills and trusts?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Hearsay.
THE COURT: Sustained.
What do I care if he's aware of that or not?
How does that help me decide the validity of these documents?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, the governor's already made a claim that --

THE COURT: But you're asking the witness if he's aware of. Are you aware the sky is blue right now? It doesn't matter to me if he's aware of it or not. Are you aware Rick Scott has started an investigation of a moon landing? It doesn't matter to me if he knows that or not. You asked him are you aware of somebody from Rick Scott's office doing something. It doesn't matter to me if he's
aware of that or not. I've got to figure out the validity of these documents, so I need to know facts about that, please. Any other questions of the witness on that?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that my father's signature?
A. I'm not an expert on your father's signature. But if it's on his will, at the bottom of his will, that must have been a copy that was obtained from the clerk of the courts, because that will was filed, and we would have conformed copies in our file, which would not have his signature at the bottom. Apparently, it is.
Q. But it does say on the document that the original will's in your safe, correct?
A. For your mother's document, it showed that.
Q. Oh, for my father's -- where are the originals of my father's?
A. Your father's original will was deposited in the court. As was your mother's.
Q. How many copies of it were there that were original?
A. Only one original. I think Mr. Rose had stated on the record that he requested a copy from the clerk of the court of your father's original will, to
make a copy of it.
Q. Certified?
A. I'm not sure if he said it was certified or not.
Q. Is that your signature on my father's will?

MR. BERNSTEIN: This is Exhibit 4, Your Honor,
Page 7.
THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Is that my father's signature?
A. Appears to be.
Q. Whose signature is that?
A. That's my signature.
Q. Oh, okay. So the only two witnesses you see on this document are you and Kimberly Moran; is that correct?
A. On that page.
Q. And both you and Kimberly Moran have had misconduct in these cases?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled. But it's cumulative.
MR. ROSE: It's cumulative.

THE COURT: How many times do I need to know this?

MR. BERNSTEIN: What does that mean exactly,
cumulative? I don't get that. I'm sorry.
THE COURT: Let's say you hit me over the head with a two-by-four. That's one time. If you do it twice, that's cumulative. Cumulative's not allowed.

MR. BERNSTEIN: That's an objection, is that I've asked it --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. BERNSTEIN: -- and it was answered? Is that what it's kind of saying?

THE COURT: Yes, asked and answered. That's another way of saying it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Now I got it.

THE COURT: Asked and answered is a similar way to say it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Sorry.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that my father's signature, to the best of your knowledge?
A. Appears to be, yes.
Q. And is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And here, did Kimberly Moran properly notarize this document?
A. Kimberly did not notarize the document.
Q. Or Lindsay Baxley, did she check one -- either the person was personally known or produced identification?
A. No. This is what Mr. Rose had gone over earlier.
Q. No, those, I believe, are in other documents we'll get to.

So this notarization, as far as you can tell, is incomplete?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Are we on Exhibit 2?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No.

THE COURT: We're on Exhibit 4, as far as I recall.

MR. BERNSTEIN: He does not miss a thing.
Your Honor, page 8.
THE WITNESS: This is Si's documents.

MR. ROSE: Got it.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. So on Simon's trust, weeks before he dies, the notarization's improper?
A. This was the same document we spoke about before. Yes, she did not circle "known to me," although...
Q. So she didn't know you or Simon?
A. No, she knew all of us. She just neglected to
circle "known to me."
Q. And that's one of the three functions of a notary, to the best of your knowledge, to determine the person is in the presence that day by some form of \(I\) either know you or you gave me a license; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So your firm -- have you done anything since knowing this document's improperly notarized to correct it with the courts?

MR. ROSE: Objection. It misstates facts. He
didn't say it was improperly notarized.
THE COURT: Just state the objection, please.

MR. ROSE: Well, calls for a legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. MORRISSEY: Another objection. It
misstates the law.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that Lindsay -- oh, you can't answer that.

So, to the best of your ability, regarding your signature, Kimberly or Lindsay Baxley has failed to state that you either were known to her or produced identification?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. We'll go on to
document 5.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that my father's initials, to the best of your knowledge?
A. Appears to be, yes.
Q. Do these initials look similar to you, this one on page 2, next to this one on page 3, next to that thing on page 4?
A. Initials typically don't look perfect page to page, and they don't necessarily look similar page to page. I have seen clients execute a lot of documents, and by the time they get to, you know, the second and third document, their signatures and their initials do not necessarily look --
Q. Look at page 13, for example. I mean, this is almost -- if we go through page by page, tell me if you see any that are even similar. On page -- let's start back at the beginning, if that'll help you.

That? Do those look similar to you as you're flipping through those?
A. Yeah, they have a lot of the same -- similar ending marks. Your father's ending mark was that line. I mean, it's on every single solitary page.
Q. Okay. So your testimony today is those are my father's initials?
A. That they were.
Q. Okay.
A. I was there when he was...
Q. And you've looked at all of these, page 19, page 20? Those look similar to what you're saying -- or why don't you just look at them. If you go through them all, they all look different. But okay.
A. They all look different, and they all look consistent at the same time.
Q. Okay. Is that -- on page 24 , is that my father's signature?
A. Appears to be.
Q. Is that your signature?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Now, this is another trust document that Lindsay Baxley did that's supposed to be notarized, a will and trust, \(I\) believe, and the amended and restated.

Can you tell that Simon Bernstein was present or produced -- or present that day by the notarization?
A. She again failed to mark that he was personally known, but she worked for him.
Q. So these dispositive documents are improperly
```

notarized?

```

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative. Legal conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. And then let's go to the first amendment to Shirley Bernstein's trust. Is this a document prepared --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, that would be 6.

THE COURT: All right.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is that a document prepared by your law firm?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. And do you see where it's, "Now therefore by executing this instrument \(I\) hereby amend the trust agreement as following"? And what is it -- what are the numbering sequences there?
A. It says, I hereby delete a paragraph of article --
Q. What number is that?
A. Paragraph B -- it's number 1.
Q. Okay. And what's Number 2?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Best evidence. It's in
evidence. And it's cumulative.

THE COURT: Two is in evidence, as is
paragraph one and paragraph three. And I've read --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, no. But Number 1, Your Honor, take a look real quick. Number 1; there's no Number 2.

THE COURT: The objection came on your next question, and that was dealing with paragraph 2 , which says it's already in evidence. And it is.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, no, not paragraph 2. Look at down below. Under the "now therefore," there's a Number 1, and I was asking him what Number 2 reads.

THE COURT: I know you were.
MR. BERNSTEIN: And there is no Number 2.
THE COURT: You've asked me to look at Exhibit No. 6, right? Plaintiff's Exhibit 6 has, under the therefore clause, a one, a two and a three. Are you asking me to look at a different document?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I approach?
THE COURT: Sure. All right. So that's a different Number 6 than I have. So let's see your Number 6.

MR. BERNSTEIN: What do I do on that?
THE COURT: That's not my decision.

MR. BERNSTEIN: That's his book, not my book, just so you know.

THE COURT: Well, that Tab 6 is different than my Tab 6. So there you go.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Well, which -- what do I go off there?

THE COURT: I have no --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I submit that into evidence?

THE COURT: I have no preference.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'd like to submit this, because I'm not sure if the other one is in evidence wrong.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection?

MR. ROSE: Could I just see the book? Would you mind?

THE COURT: Here, I'll show you my book. You can look at that book and see what's going on.

And this will be a good time for us to take a short break, and let you all straighten it out. So we'll be back in session in 15 minutes. And then we'll go to the bitter end. Each of you has about 60 minutes remaining.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, when you say "60 minutes remaining," we haven't got through all
the witnesses yet.
THE COURT: Well, we will have by the end of 60 minutes on each side.

This trial is over at five o'clock. I told you when we started each of you has half of the time; please use it wisely; use it as you wish. I've tried to encourage both sides to be efficient. When your time is gone, that's the end of the trial for you.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, the case manager --
THE COURT: When their trial is gone --
MR. BERNSTEIN: At the case management, they said it would take a day. I argued and said to you it would take days. I mean, they've got 10 witnesses. I need to have all the people who witnessed these documents here.

THE COURT: Remember when I said a moment ago we're in recess? I was serious. Thanks. We'll go back in session 15 minutes from now.
(A break was taken.)
THE COURT: We're ready to resume. Are there any further questions for the witness on cross?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. We were just working out that 1, 2, 3, Exhibit No. 6, so that we get the record straight.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Shall I get a copy of yours, you get a copy of mine? Or how do you want to do that?

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, I tried to work it out.

THE COURT: Listen, \(I\) don't have any preference as to how we do anything. You all tell me how you've worked it out, and if I agree with it, I'll accept it.

MR. ROSE: The copy that's been marked for the witness, the copy in my book and the copy in your book are all identical. I don't know what's in his book, and he wouldn't show me his book on the break.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: But I'm fine. It's a three-page document. And if he wants to put it in evidence, even though it's not operative, I have no objection.

THE COURT: Okay. So are you putting something into evidence?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. The one that I --

THE COURT: Have you showed it to the other
side yet? You can't put secret documents into evidence, only after they've been seen by everyone.

Let's at least show it to the other side so they know the document that's being proffered as an exhibit. If they still have no objection, I'll receive it as Defendant's 3.

MR. ROSE: This is in evidence already as Exhibit No. -- as Plaintiff's No. 3.

MR. BERNSTEIN: So what's 6? So now I don't even have the right 6 document.

MR. ROSE: The 6 that the witness has is three pages. It's the same 6 that's in your book and it's in my book. It's three consecutive pages of the production from Tescher \& Spallina law firm. It has the inoperative first amendment as page 1, then it has the operative first amendment as page 2, and the signature page as page 3. It's the same document in everybody's book. That's all I can tell you.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, in my book, 3 and 6 are the identical documents --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- so I would need --
THE COURT: Are there any other questions of the witness?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I was going to ask him
questions on this document.
THE COURT: All right. Well, then, let's go.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I need a -- I don't have the 6 that everybody else is referring to. My sinks is the same as --

THE COURT: There you go. Take whatever you need.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Thank you. I think we missed 6. It's just short on 6.

THE COURT: All right. Then here's my Tab 6.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: The idea is to keep moving.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll move on. I'm almost done here.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. So on Exhibit 3, can you list the numbers there?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Best evidence.
Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

You need to refer to which page. That's a multi-page document, and both pages have numbered paragraphs on them.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Page 1 of 2.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. The Roman Numeral -- or the numerals, can you give the sequence of those numbers?
A. One and three. It's skipping two.
Q. And this is a document you allege to be part of the Shirley trust that you're claiming is valid?
A. That's the amendment that Shirley executed in November of 2008 .
Q. And would there be a reason why your law firm numbers one, three?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Overruled.

You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Human error.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. But it is an error in the document that you're claiming is valid Shirley trust?
A. It's a numbering error.
Q. In the document, you're claiming this is a valid amendment, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then in number 6 from the judge, what's the numbering sequence?
A. One, two, three.
Q. Okay. So you added in a number two?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How did you go about doing that?
A. There was a paragraph two inserted between one and three.
Q. Well, the paragraph that's inserted between one and three wouldn't fit there.

So what did you do?
A. The document was opened up and a paragraph was inserted.
Q. Okay. So you increased the spacing on the document, correct, by adding a number three, correct?
A. Adding number two, yes.
Q. By adding number two, correct.

Okay. So you actually had to alter the chronology as it was placed on the document? You didn't just put a number two there in between one and three? You actually went and expanded the document with words that were inserted by you fraudulently, right?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.

Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, the witness does have the exhibits in front of him. If Mr. Bernstein could be at the podium.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I don't know if he has all the exhibits.

THE COURT: Well, do you have the exhibit that I gave you from the Court's?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, jeez.

THE COURT: Because I'd like to have it back so that that doesn't get lost.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. You gave me the one with one, two, three.

Can I get a copy of this from the clerk?

THE BAILIFF: There is no clerk.

THE COURT: Can I have the document back, please? He's not a clerk.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Marshall, sheriff, officer, sir. Sorry about that.

THE COURT: He does not make copies.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: Thanks. Any other questions of the witness? Your time is rapidly disappearing.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Just going through that.
THE COURT: And I think you said earlier you have no objection to Plaintiff's 6 being received as an exhibit?

MR. ROSE: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROSE: Thank you.
THE COURT: Then it's in evidence as

Plaintiff's 6. I'm making it Plaintiff's 6, rather than Defendant's 3, because it's already marked and it's been referred to by that number.
(Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 6 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are these your notes?
A. No, they're not. Those are Don's.
Q. Do you know the date on that note?
A. \(3 / 12 / 08\).
Q. Did you take any notes in the meeting?
A. Those are my notes there.
Q. These are? Oh, so this is a compilation of Don's and your notes?
A. Those are my notes, yes.
Q. And those were taken on that day?
A. Correct.
Q. Whose notes are those?
A. I just saw those for the first time today. I believe they're your father's notes.
Q. How would you know those are my father's notes?
A. Mr. Rose introduced that document earlier.
Q. Document 12 , did it come from your offices?
A. I don't know where it came from.
Q. Did you Bates stamp this document as part of your documents?
A. I don't recall ever seeing that document.
Q. And it doesn't have your Bates stamp from your production, right?
A. Correct.
Q. You were supposed to turn over all your records, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. He's testified it
wasn't in his --

THE COURT: What's the objection to the
question?
MR. ROSE: Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: All right. Your Honor, I'm
done.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

Is there any redirect?

MR. ROSE: Brief, Your Honor. REDIRECT (ROBERT SPALLINA)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Assuming the documents are valid, they'll have to be a later trial to determine the effect of Simon's
exercise of his power of appointment?
A. Yes.
Q. It doesn't have any direct bearing on whether these five documents are valid?
A. No.
Q. And I take it you don't necessarily agree with Mr. Tescher's view as expressed in his letter of January 14th, 2014?
A. Again, I'm seeing that here. Surprised to see that.
Q. The original documents, the wills, you retained at all times of Shirley and Simon in your firm?
A. Prior to their death, yes.
Q. And that's consistent practice for a trust and estate lawyer, to keep it in your will vault or in your safe deposit box?
A. Yes. I would say most attorneys do that just because there's only one original of the will, and very often documents can get lost if clients take documents home. So, typically, they're kept in a safe deposit box or a safe or something like that, and left with the attorney.
Q. I want to make sure I understand and the Court understands what happened with the waiver forms.

While Simon was alive, he signed a petition
for discharge; is that correct?
A. Correct. April of '08.
Q. And --

MR. BERNSTEIN: What exhibit? Excuse me.
What number are we looking at?
MR. ROSE: None -- well, actually, it's in my
book. If you want to follow along, it's Tab 28.
But it's not in evidence.
BY MR. ROSE:
Q. And Simon also then filed a waiver of accounting himself?
A. Correct.
Q. And is it necessary for Simon, even though he's the personal representative, to sign a waiver of accounting because he's a beneficiary?
A. I mean, we do it as a matter of course.
Q. And the signature of Simon Bernstein on April 9th, that's genuinely his signature?
A. Can I see?
Q. Exhibit 28 is a petition that was filed with the court. I'm going to just show you the exhibits. Exhibit A says "Petition for discharge full waiver."

Is this a document you would have prepared for Simon Bernstein to sign?
A. Yeah, our firm would prepare that.
Q. Okay. And it's a three-page document.

Is that Simon Bernstein's signature --
A. Yes, it is.
Q. -- April 9th, 2012?
A. Yes, he signed the document.
Q. And he was alive when he signed the document?
A. Yes, he was.
Q. Okay. Then he had to sign a waiver of accounting, which he signed on the same day?
A. Correct.
Q. And you have a document waiver of accounting on the next page signed by Eliot Bernstein on May 15th?
A. Correct.
Q. And there's no doubt that's Eliot's signature because he's the one who emailed you the document, correct?
A. And sent us the original by mail.
Q. Right. And we already have an exhibit which is his email that sent you his waiver form?
A. Correct.
Q. And the waiver forms of Ted, Pam, Lisa and Jill are all valid, signed by them on the date that they indicated they signed it?
A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
Q. So then these got submitted to the court.

Is there anything wrong with submitting waiver
forms to the court signed by Simon while he's alive after he had passed away?
A. Maybe we should have made a motion to, you know, have a successor \(P R\) appointed and file the documents through the successor \(P R\).
Q. Were you trying to just save expenses because there was nothing in the estate?
A. Correct.
Q. And if Judge Colin had not rejected -- or his assistant had not rejected the documents, and the estate was closed, it would have been closed based on legitimate, properly signed documents of Simon and his five children?
A. Correct.
Q. So then they get kicked back to your law firm, and you could file a motion and undertake some expense, instead --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Object. This has been asked and answered.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. Now, does the fact that -- well, strike that.

At the time that Simon signed his 2012 will and 2012 trust, had there been ever anyone question a
signature or a notarization of any document that had been prepared by your law firm?
A. No, there was not.
Q. You didn't see anything or observe anything or any behavior of Simon Bernstein during the course of any meeting you had with him that would call into question his competence or his ability to properly execute a testamentary document?
A. We did not.

MR. ROSE: Nothing further, Your Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
Thank you, sir. You can step down.
MR. ROSE: At this time, we would rest our case.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Any evidence from the defendant's side?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I'd like -- can 1 call
back Spallina?
THE COURT: If you want to call him as a witness on your behalf, sure.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah, sure.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Spallina, you're still under oath, and you're being called as a defense witness now. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Spallina, when Simon died on

September 12th -- or September 13th -- sorry -- 2012, and you were responsible as his attorney to appoint Ted as the successor, correct, you were in charge of his wills and trusts?

THE COURT: You just asked three questions in a row.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, sorry.

THE COURT: Which question would you like the witness to answer?

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. When Simon died, was Shirley's estate closed?
A. No, it was not.
Q. Okay. Did you appoint a successor to Simon who was the personal representative of Shirley on the day he died?
A. I don't understand the question.
Q. Well, on the day Simon died, there was a successor to him in the will, correct?
A. That's correct. Ted.
Q. Okay. Did you appoint Ted?
A. I did not appoint Ted. Si did.
Q. Si appointed Ted?
A. Si appointed Ted as a successor trustee under the document -- I mean, Shirley appointed Ted as the successor trustee to si under the document.
Q. So Simon didn't appoint Ted?
A. Simon did not appoint Ted.
Q. Okay.
A. He was the named successor under your mother's document.
Q. Okay. So when Simon died -- just so I get all this clear, when Simon died, your law firm knew Ted was the successor, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. According to your story. Okay.
A. Under Shirley's documents, you're talking about.
Q. Under the alleged Shirley document.

Okay. But yet did Simon then -- after he died, did he not close the estate of Shirley while he was dead?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative. It's cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ROSE: And I believe this whole line of questioning's been covered ad nauseam in the first cross-examination.

THE COURT: Well, it's important not to ask the same thing over and over again. You have finite time to work with.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. The estate of Shirley was closed in January, correct, of 2013?
A. I don't recall, but it sounds -- it has to be sometime after November.
Q. Okay. So it was closed by Simon, who was dead at that time, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did Ted Bernstein close the Estate of Shirley Bernstein as the successor personal representative?
A. No.
Q. Who closed the Estate of Shirley Bernstein?
A. The documents were filed with the court based on the original petition that your father signed.
Q. Did you close the estate?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: What's the relevance?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, I'm trying to figure out
who closed my mom's estate.

THE COURT: What's the relevance I've got to figure out?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. The documents, they were bringing up these waivers. There's relevance to this.

THE COURT: Well, I'll sustain the objection.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. On this petition for discharge that Mr. Rose brought up on his cross -- and I can't remember where I just pulled that -- I'm going to take a look. That would be 28 .

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I admit this into evidence, Your Honor, since I believe Mr. Rose stated it wasn't?

THE COURT: You're just picking up a piece of paper and walking up to me and saying, can \(I\) admit this into evidence?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, they didn't admit it.

THE COURT: Is there a foundation laid for its admissibility?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Do I know what it is so that I can make a ruling?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh. It's a petition for
discharge.
THE COURT: Did anybody testify to that, or are you just --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah, he just did.
THE COURT: If you have a piece of paper you want to have me consider as an exhibit, the other side has to have seen it and the witness has to have seen it so I'll know what it is.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. They were just talking about it.

MR. ROSE: Your Honor, just to speed things along, we have no objection to this document coming into evidence. It is part of our Exhibit 28. The whole 28 could come in evidence. That's fine with me. Then it would all be in evidence. Or however you wish to do it.

THE COURT: I'm letting this party take charge of his own case.

Are you asking that to be received as an exhibit? There's no objection. So that'll be Defendant's 3. Hand that up, and I'll mark it.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Thank you.
(Defendant's Exhibit No. 3 was received into evidence.)

THE COURT: So are you done with it?
MR. BERNSTEIN: No. Can I use it still?
THE COURT: Anything that's supposed to be an exhibit in evidence has to come back to me.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Gotcha.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. On this document, it's a petition for a discharge, a "full waiver," it says.

Was this document sent back to your firm as not notarized by Judge Colin's office?
A. I'm not sure. I didn't get the documents back.
Q. Is it notarized?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Did you sign as the notary?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Overruled.

The question was, is it notarized? The answer
was no. Then you asked if -- somebody else, if they'd sign, and then the witness if he signed as a notary.

THE WITNESS: I signed it as the attorney for the estate.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. On April 9th with Simon Bernstein?
A. Yeah, it appears that way.
Q. Could it be another way?
A. It didn't -- this document did not require that I witness Si's signature. So I believe that that document was sent to Si, and he signed it, sent it back, we signed it and filed it.
Q. So you sent it to Si, he signed it, then sent it back, and you signed it all on April 9th?
A. It doesn't -- it's what day he signed it that's relevant. He signed it on April 9th.
Q. And what day did you sign it?
A. I could have signed it April 11th.
Q. Well, where does it say April 11th?
A. My signature doesn't require a date. His does.
Q. Why?
A. Just doesn't.
Q. Well, the date that the document says this document's being signed on April 9th.
A. I did not sign that exhibit.
Q. Next question. On September 13, 2013, the year after my father died, in Judge Martin Colin's court, when he discovered this document, did he threaten to read you your Miranda Rights, stating he had enough evidence to read you Mirandas?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you deposit this document, this April 9th full discharge, with the court?
A. Did I personally do it?
Q. Did your law firm?
A. No, the law firm did, yes.
Q. Okay. And on whose behalf?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. ROSE: And relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Simon was dead when this document was deposited with the court, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative. Relevance.

THE COURT: I've got that he is dead written
down here several times. It's clear in my mind.

You're not moving in a positive direction.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I understand that part.

THE COURT: All right. New question, please.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is this document sworn to and attested by my
father? Is it a sworn statement? Does it say "under penalties of perjury"?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. So under penalties of perjury, on April 9th, my father and you signed a document, it appears, that states that Simon has fully administered the estate.

Was that done?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. He had settled the estate, made dispositions of all claims of Shirley's estate?
A. He was the only beneficiary of the estate. The creditor period had passed.
Q. He was the only beneficiary of the will?
A. He was the only beneficiary of the will if he -- that's if he survived your mother.
Q. Did you say earlier that the five children were tangible personal property devisees or beneficiaries under the will?
A. I did not. I said your father was the sole beneficiary of your mother's estate by virtue of surviving her.
Q. I thought you mentioned -- can I take a look at the will?

Okay. On Simon's will, which is Exhibit 4
here --
A. This is your mother's will we're talking about.
Q. Well, hold on. Well, you did state there were mirror documents, correct, at one point? That's okay. I'll proceed. That part seems to be in error.

Does the document say, "I, Shirley Bernstein, of Palm Beach County, Florida hereby revoke all of my prior wills and codicils and make this will my spouse's assignment. My children are Ted, Pam -- Pamela Simon, Eliot Bernstein, Jill Iantoni and Lisa Friedstein"?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Best evidence and cumulative.

THE COURT: Sustained.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Was there a separate written memorandum prepared for this will?
A. No, there was not.
Q. And if Simon didn't survive, the property would be going to the children, correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ROSE: Best evidence and cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: What was -- I missed that.
Can I not ask him that question I just asked?
THE COURT: I sustained the objection. You can ask a new question of him.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Is there any chance that the children could be beneficiaries of anything under this will?
A. Not at the time of your mother's death. Your father survived.
Q. So at the time of her death, you're saying that -- if they both died together, would the children --

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevancy. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. -- be beneficiaries?

THE COURT: Sustained.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'm done with him.
MR. ROSE: No questions.
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. You can step down now.

Next witness, please.
MR. BERNSTEIN: My next witness, are you saying?

THE COURT: If you have another witness, now's
the time to call him or her.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Ted Bernstein -- well, one second.

Is Kimberly Moran, your witness, here? Is Kimberly Moran, an exhibited witness, here, Mr. Rose?

THE COURT: Listen, it's your case. I've asked if you have any other witnesses. Do you have any other witnesses?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, I don't. I was going to call some of their witnesses, but they're not here.

THE COURT: Okay. So you aren't going to call anybody?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes, I'm going to call Ted Bernstein.

THE COURT: Well, that's a witness, right?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah, yeah. I just was
looking for the other ones on the witness list. I didn't know if they were sitting outside.

Thereupon,
(TED BERNSTEIN)
having been first duly sworn or affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:

THE WITNESS: I do. DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Ted --

THE COURT: You've got to ask the witness his name. The record needs to reflect who's testifying.

MR. ROSE: And could I just ask that he stay at the podium?

THE COURT: Okay. You need to stay near the microphone so that I can hear and the court reporter can accurately hear you. And then if you need to go up to the witness stand for some reason, you're allowed to do that.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. State your name for the record.
A. Ted Bernstein.
Q. Is that your full formal name?
A. That is.
Q. Do you go by Theodore Stuart Bernstein ever?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. Is that your name on your birth certificate?
A. Which one?
Q. Theodore Stuart Bernstein?
A. It is not.
Q. Okay. Ted, you were made aware of Robert

Spallina's fraudulent alteration of a trust document of your mother's when?
A. I believe that was in the early 2013 or '14.
Q. Okay. And when you found out, you were the fiduciary of Shirley's trust, allegedly?
A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
Q. When you found out that there was a fraudulent altercation [sic] of a trust document, were you the fiduciary in charge of Shirley's trust?
A. I was trustee, yes. I am trustee, yes.
Q. And your attorneys, Tescher and Spallina, and their law firm are the one who committed that fraud, correct, who altered that document?
A. That's what's been admitted to by them, correct.
Q. Okay. So you became aware that your counsel that you retained as trustee had committed a fraud, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. What did you do immediately after that?
A. The same day that I found out, I contacted counsel. I met with counsel on that very day. I met with counsel the next day. I met with counsel the day after that.
Q. Which counsel?
A. Alan Rose.
Q. Oh. Okay. So he was -- so Tescher and Spallina were your counsel as trustee, but Alan Rose became that day?
A. I'm not sure when, but I consulted him immediately. You asked me when.

MR. ROSE: Can \(I\) caution the witness that it's fine to say who he consulted with. I think the advice was the attorney-client privilege I would instruct him on.

THE COURT: All right. The attorney-client privilege is available, and your client is on the stand. Counsel's reminding him that it exists.

Are there any other questions? What is the time period that you're asking about here?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Right after he discovered that there had been a fraudulent, invalid will created.

THE COURT: Right. And you're asking him what he did afterwards?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Right afterwards.
THE COURT: Okay. Have your mother and father
both passed away at the time you're asking him
that?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Correct.
THE COURT: So the validity of the documents
that I've got to figure out won't have anything to do with the questions you're asking him now about his actions at trustee, will they?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: Tell me how.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Because, Your Honor, when he found out that there was fraud by his attorneys that he retained, the question is, what did they do with those documents? Did he come to the court to correct --

THE COURT: The question you're asking him is what did he do.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
THE COURT: Well, that doesn't tell me anything about what the attorneys did. So I'll sustain my own objection. I want to keep you on track here. You're running out of time, and I want you to stay focused on what I've got to figure out. You've got a lot more on your mind than I do. I explained that to you earlier. Do you have any other questions on the issues that I've got to resolve at this point?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Have you seen the original will and trust of
your mother's?
A. Can you define original for me?
Q. The original.
A. The one that's filed in the court?
Q. Original will or the trust.
A. I've seen copies of the trusts.
Q. Have you done anything to have any of the documents authenticated since learning that your
attorneys had committed fraud in altering dispositive
documents that you were in custody of?
MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I have not.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So you as the trustee have taken no steps to validate these documents; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Why is that?
A. I'm not an expert on the validity of documents.
Q. Did you contract a forensic analyst?
A. I'm retained by counsel, and I've got counsel retained for all of this. So I'm not an expert on the validity of the documents.
Q. You're the fiduciary. You're the trustee.

You're the guy in charge. You're the guy who hires your counsel. You tell them what to do.

So you found out that your former attorneys committed fraud. And my question is simple. Did you do anything, Ted Bernstein, to validate these documents, the originals?

THE COURT: That's already been answered in the negative. I wrote it down. Let's keep going.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. As you sit here today, if the documents in your mother's -- in the estates aren't validated and certain documents are thrown out if the judge rules them not valid, will you or your family gain or lose any benefit in any scenario?
A. Can you repeat that for me, please? I'm not sure I'm understanding.
Q. If the judge invalidates some of the documents here today, will you personally lose money, interest in the estates and trusts as the trustee, your family, you?
A. I will not.
Q. Your family?
A. My -- my children will.
Q. So that's your family?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So do you find that as a fiduciary to be a conflict?

MR. ROSE: Objection.
THE WITNESS: No.

MR. ROSE: I think it calls for a legal
conclusion.

THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Well, would it matter to you one way or the other how these documents are validated?
A. What would matter to me would be to follow the documents that are deemed to be valid and follow the court orders that suggest and deem that they are valid. That would be what I would be charged to do.
Q. So you can sit here today and tell me that the validity of these documents, even though your family will lose 40 percent, has no effect on you?
A. It has no effect on me.
Q. Okay. And you don't find that to be adverse to certain beneficiaries as the trustee?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Calls for a legal
conclusion.
THE COURT: Well, what difference does it make to me? I mean, what he thinks about his role is just not relevant to me.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, Your Honor --

THE COURT: So the next question, please. That's not relevant.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So in no way have you tried to authenticate these documents as the trustee?

THE COURT: He has already said that. That's the third time you've asked it, at least. And I've written it down. It's on my papers.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll let it go. I'll
let him go today.

THE COURT: Okay. You have no further
questions of the witness.

Is there any cross?

MR. ROSE: Briefly.

CROSS (TED BERNSTEIN)

BY MR. ROSE:
Q. You did a few things to authenticate the documents, didn't you? You filed a lawsuit?
A. Yes.
Q. In fact, we're here today because you filed a lawsuit to ask this judge to determine if these five documents are valid, correct?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you fired Mr. Tescher and Spallina on the
spot?
A. Correct.
Q. Called the bar association?
A. The next business day.
Q. You consulted with counsel, and we retained additional probate counsel over the weekend?
A. We did.
Q. So as far as authenticating the documents, you personally believe these are genuine and valid documents, right?
A. I do.
Q. And you, in fact, were in your office the day your father signed them?
A. That's correct.
Q. And witnessed Mr. Spallina and the notary coming to the office to sign the documents?
A. Yes, that's right.
Q. And you had been on a conference call with your father, your brother and your three sisters where your father told you exactly what he was going to do?
A. That is also correct.
Q. And the documents that we're looking at today do exactly what your father told everybody, including your brother, Eliot, he was going to do on the conference call in May of 2012?
A. Yes, that is correct also.
Q. Now, I think you were asked a good question. Do you care one way or the other how these documents are decided by the Court?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Did you care when your father or mother made a document that did not specifically leave any money to you?
A. I did not.
Q. Now, did you care for anybody other than yourself?
A. I cared for the -- for the sake of my children.
Q. And why did you care for the sake of your children?
A. My parents had a very good relationship with my children, and I did not want my children to misinterpret what the intentions of their grandparents were and would have been. And for that reason, I felt that it would have been difficult for my children.
Q. Did you ever have access to the original will of your father or mother that were in the Tescher \& Spallina vaults?
A. I have no access, no.
Q. Did you ever have access to the original
copies of the trusts that Mr. Spallina testified were sitting in their firm's file cabinets or vaults?
A. I did not.
Q. Now, did you find in your father's possessions the duplicate originals of the trusts of him and your mother that we've talked about?
A. I did.
Q. And do you have any reason to believe that they aren't valid, genuine and signed by your father on the day that he -- your father and your mother on the days that it says they signed them?
A. None whatsoever.
Q. You need to get a ruling on whether these five documents are valid in order for you to do your job as the trustee, correct?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Whichever way the Court rules, will you follow the final judgment of the Court and exactly consistent with what the documents say, and follow the advice of your counsel in living up to the documents as the Court construes them?
A. Always. A hundred percent.

MR. ROSE: Nothing further, sir.
THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Is there any redirect?
REDIRECT (TED BERNSTEIN)

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You just stated that you came to the court and validated the documents in this hearing today; is that correct?

MR. ROSE: Objection. It mis -BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You filed a motion to validate the documents today?

THE COURT: Wait. You've got to let me rule on the objection.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, sorry. I don't hear any objection.

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Since -- did you file a motion that we're here for today for validity?
A. Explain motion.
Q. A motion with the court for a validity hearing that we're here at right now.
A. Do you mean the lawsuit?
Q. Well, yeah.
A. Yes, we did file a lawsuit, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know when you filed that?
A. No. I don't know, Eliot. I don't know when I
filed it. I don't have it committed to memory.
Q. Do you have an idea?

MR. ROSE: Objection. I think the court file
will reflect when the case was filed.
THE COURT: Overruled.
The question was answered, I don't know. Next question.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Prior to filing this lawsuit, Mr. Rose said you couldn't do anything because you didn't know if the documents were valid.

My question is, did you do anything from the time you found out the documents might not be valid and needed a validity hearing to today at this validity hearing?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: What's the relevance?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, he knew about these documents being fraudulent for X months.

THE COURT: What will that help me decide on the validity of the five documents?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Why, Your Honor, they didn't come to the court knowing that they needed a validity hearing, and instead disposed and
disbursed of assets while they've known all this time --

THE COURT: I'll sustain the objection.
I'm not called to rule upon that stuff. I'm called to rule upon the validity of these five paper documents. That's what I'm going to figure out at the end of the day.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Mr. Rose asked you if you found documents and they all looked valid to you, and you responded yes.

Are you an expert?
A. I am not.
Q. Can you describe what you did to make that analysis?
A. They looked like they were their signatures on the documents. I had no reason whatsoever to think those weren't the documents that were their planning documents. I had no reason at all to think that.
Q. Even after your hired attorneys that were representing you admitted fraud, you didn't think there was any reason to validate the documents?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Argumentative.
THE COURT: Sustained.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Did you find any reason to validate these
documents forensically?
A. I think I answered that by saying that we filed a lawsuit.
Q. No, I'm asking you to have a
forensic -- you're the trustee. And as a beneficiary -to protect the beneficiaries, do you think you should validate these documents with a handwriting expert due to the fact that we have multiple instances of fraud by your counsel who were acting on your behalf?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative and argument.

THE COURT: The question is, does he think something. I've already told you when you ask a question do you think, I stop listening. It's not relevant what the witness thinks.

So I'll sustain the objection.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. As a trustee, would you find it to be your fiduciary duty upon learning of document forgeries and frauds by your counsel to have the dispositive documents you're operating under validated by a professional handwriting expert, forensic expert, et cetera?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Do you think these documents should be validated -- you're the trustee.

Do you think these documents should be validated by a professional firm forensically?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: It's not relevant. You just asked
him if he thinks he should have had them validated.

I don't care what he thinks. In making my
decisions today, what he thinks he should have done or not done isn't relevant. I'm looking for facts.

So I really wish you would address your questions to facts.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So, to the best of your knowledge, have these documents been forensically analyzed by any expert?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Cumulative.
THE COURT: No, they are not. I already know that. I wrote it down. He's already said they've not been.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Ted, when your father signed, allegedly, his 2012 documents in July, were you aware of any medical problems with your father?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Were you aware that I took him for a biopsy of his brain?
A. I'm not aware of that, no.
Q. Were you aware of the headaches he was suffering that caused him to go for a biopsy of his brain?
A. I don't believe he had a biopsy of his brain. But if he did, then I'm not aware of it.
Q. Oh, okay. Were you aware of headaches your father was suffering?
A. I recall he was having some headaches.
Q. Were you aware that he was seeing a psychiatrist?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you aware of the reasons he was seeing a psychiatrist?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. Were you ever in the psychiatrist's office with him?
A. Yes.
Q. For what reason?
A. I wanted to have a conversation with him.
Q. About?
A. About some personal issues that I wanted to
discuss with him.
Q. Personal issues such as?

MR. ROSE: Can I get clarification? Are you
talking about you wanted to -- he may have a privilege.

You were discussing Simon's issues or your own personal issues?

THE WITNESS: They were both intertwined together.

MR. ROSE: I think it's subject to a privilege.

THE COURT: All right. Well, you've been warned by your attorney you've got a psychologist-client privilege, so use it as you will.

MR. BERNSTEIN: He's not a client of the psychiatrist, I don't think.

THE COURT: I beg to differ with you.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, he is?
THE COURT: Because the answer just clarified that he was in part seeking to be a client. Did you listen to his clarification of his answer?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No.
THE COURT: Well, I did very closely.
MR. BERNSTEIN: What was it?

THE COURT: Next question, please.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll just see it on the transcript.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Were you aware of any medical conditions, depression, anything like that your father was experiencing prior to his death?
A. I never found our father to suffer from any kind of depression or anything like that during his lifetime.
Q. So after your mother died, he wasn't depressed?
A. No.

MR. ROSE: Could I again ask Mr. Bernstein to step to the podium and not be so close to my client?

THE COURT: If you speak into the microphone,
it'll be even more easy to hear your questions.

Thank you.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. So, according to you, your father's state of mind was perfectly fine after his wife died of -- a number of years --
A. I didn't say that.
Q. Okay. He wasn't depressed?
A. That's what I said.
Q. Were you aware of any medications he was on?
A. I was, yes.
Q. Such as?
A. From time to time, he would take something for your heart when you would have angina pains. But that he was doing for 30 years, for a good 30 years, that I knew dad was taking, whatever that medicine is when you have some chest pain.
Q. Did you have any problems with your father prior to his death?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: The question is, did you have any
problems with your dad before he died?

I'll sustain the objection.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Are you aware of any problems between you and your father that were causing him stress?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Were you aware that your father was changing his documents allegedly due to stress caused by certain of his children?
A. No.
Q. Were you on a May loth phone call?
A. Yes.
Q. In that phone call, did your father --

MR. ROSE: Objection. It's beyond the scope -- well --

MR. BERNSTEIN: It has to do with the changes of the documents and the state of mind.

THE COURT: Do you have a question you want to ask? He's withdrawn whatever he was saying, so you can finish your question.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. So on May loth, at that meeting, your father stated that he was having trouble with certain of his children, and this would solve those problems.

Are you aware of that?
A. No, I don't -- not from the way you're characterizing that phone call.
Q. Well, how do you characterize that?
A. He wanted to have a conversation with his five children about some changes he was making to his documents.
Q. And you had never talked to him about the changes, that your family was disinherited?
A. No.
Q. Prior to that call?
A. No.
Q. When did you learn that you were disinherited?
A. I think when \(I\) first saw documents with --
maybe after dad -- once dad passed away.
Q. Were you aware of the contact with your sister Pam regarding her anger at your father for cutting both of you out of the will?
A. I'm aware of that.
Q. So that was before your father passed?
A. Excuse me. Can you ask -- say the end of that sentence again.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can you read that back?
(A portion of the record was read by the reporter.)

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. You asked me a question, and I had answered too quickly. What was the end of the question prior to that?
(A portion of the record was read by the reporter.)

THE WITNESS: I'm aware that she was angry
with him about how -- that he -- she was not in his documents.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. You didn't learn right there that you weren't in the documents?
A. I can't remember if it was then or if it was when dad died.
Q. Well, this is very important so can you think back to that time.

While your father was alive, did I invite you to a Passover holiday at my home?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: What's the relevance?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it's relevance to the
state of mind my dad was in while --

THE COURT: Well, you're asking did this guy get invited to your home. You didn't ask about your dad, so I'll sustain the objection. BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Okay. Did you get invited to a Passover dinner at my home that your father was attending?
A. I don't recall the circumstances of what -- whatever it is you're referring to.
Q. Do you recall saying you wouldn't come to the Passover dinner?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.
THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. BERNSTEIN:
Q. Do you recall writing me a email that stated that your family was dead for all intensive [sic] purposes?

MR. ROSE: Objection. Relevance.

THE COURT: What's the relevance to the validity of these documents?

MR. BERNSTEIN: If Si was in the right state of mind or if he was being, you know, forced at a gun to make these changes by children who had --

THE COURT: Your question asked this witness if he wrote you a letter that said his family was dead for all intents and purposes. What's that got to do with the validity of these documents?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, it establishes Simon's state of mind.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll sustain the objection. MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. All right. Well, then, I'm all done then.

THE COURT: All right.
Is there any cross?

MR. ROSE: I already crossed.

THE COURT: Oh, that's true. So you're all
set. You're done. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Alan Rose.

MR. ROSE: I object. Improper.
THE COURT: You've got 11 minutes yet.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Well, he's a witness to the chain of custody in these documents.

THE COURT: Well, you can call anybody you want. I just wanted you to know how much time you had left.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.
MR. ROSE: He wants to call me, and I object to being called as a witness.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: I don't think that's proper.
THE COURT: I don't think that's proper to call an attorney from the other side as your witness. So I accept the objection. Anybody else?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, I would agree with that normally --

THE COURT: Well, thanks.
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- but there's a small problem. The chain of custody we're trying to follow in these documents for other reasons, other criminal reasons, is Mr. Rose has pertinent information to; meaning, he claims to have discovered some of these documents and taken them
off the property.

THE COURT: I thought you said you wanted a chain of custody?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Right. Meaning --

THE COURT: Well, the chain of custody to me means the chain of custody after the time they were executed.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Right.
THE COURT: All right. He wasn't around when they were executed.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No, but he found documents that are being inserted into this court case as originals, second originals that he found personally, and wrote a letter stating, I just happened to find these documents in Simon's home -THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sustain the objection to you calling him as a surprise witness. He's a representative of your own. Do you have any other witnesses?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No. I'm good.
THE COURT: Okay. So you rest?

MR. BERNSTEIN: I rest.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there any rebuttal
evidence from the plaintiff's side?

MR. ROSE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So the evidence is closed.
We'll have time for brief closing arguments. And I'll take those now. Let me hear first from the plaintiff's side.

MR. ROSE: I'm sorry. Did you say it was time for me to speak?

THE COURT: Yes. I'm taking closing arguments now.

MR. ROSE: Okay. Thank you. May it please the Court.

We're here on a very narrow issue. And we -- you know, I apologize to the extent I put on a little bit of background. We've had an extensive litigation before Judge Colin. This is our first time here. And if any of my background bored you, I apologize.

There are five documents that are at issue, which we talked about before we started; the 2008 will and trust of Shirley Bernstein, as well as the amendment that she signed, and then the 2012 will and trust of Simon Bernstein.

So the uncontroverted evidence that you've heard was from Robert Spallina, who is an attesting witness to the documents and he was a draftsman of the documents.

I don't believe it's directly relevant to your inquiry, but you certainly heard evidence that what Simon Bernstein intended and what he communicated were his wishes; the exercise of a power of appointment through a will, the changing of the beneficiaries of his trust document by way of an amended and restated 2012 document, to give his money -- leave his wealth to his ten grandchildren. The final documents as drafted and signed are consistent with what.

But what we're here to decide is, are these documents valid and enforceable? And there are self-proving affidavits attached to the documents. And by themselves, if you find the self-proving affidavits to be valid, then the wills themselves are valid and enforceable.

Now, the only question that's been raised as to the self-proving affidavit is an issue with notarization. And we have two cases to cite to the Court on the notarization issue. One is from the Florida Supreme Court called The House of Lyons, and one is from a sister court in the State of North Carolina.

THE COURT: Just a second.
Sir, would you just have a seat. You're
making me nervous.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Sure.
THE COURT: Thanks.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Just aching.
THE COURT: Well, I understand. But just have a seat. That'll be better. Thanks.

And I'm sorry for the interruption.
MR. ROSE: No, that's all right.
If I may I approach with the two cases we would rely on.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: The House of Lyons. The second is a case from Georgia. The House of Lyons case is from the Florida Supreme Court. It deals in a slightly different context, but it deals with notarization. And so what you have here is, we've put on evidence. The documents that are in evidence, that these documents were signed properly. The witnesses were in the presence of each other, and the testator and the notary notarized them.

Shirley's documents from 2008, there's no question that all the boxes were checked. There is a question that's been raised with regard to Simon's 2012 will and his 2012 trust; that the
notary -- rather than the law firm employee notarizing them, these were notarized by Simon's -the testimony is by an employee of Simon's company, not a legal expert. And if on the face of the two documents -- and for the record, these would be Exhibits 4, which is Simon's will, and Exhibit 5, which is Simon's trust.

On Exhibit 4, there's no box to check. The whole information is written out. And I don't believe there's any requirement that someone circled the word -- if you just read it as an English sentence, the notary confirmed that it was sworn to and ascribed before me the witness is Robert L. Spallina, who is personally known to me or who has produced no identification.

So I think the natural inference from that sentence is that person was known to him, Kimberly Moran, who was personally known to me, and Simon Bernstein, who was personally known to me. So on its face, I think it -- the only inference you could draw from this is that the person knew them.

Now, we've established from testimony that she in fact knew the three of them, and we've established by way of Exhibit 16, which was signed on the same day and notarized by the same person.

And Exhibit 16, unlike Exhibit 4, which doesn't have a little check mark, Exhibit 16 has a check mark, and the notary properly checks personally known to the people that she was notarizing.

So I believe -- and the In Re Lyon case stands for substantial compliance with a notary is sufficient. And the North Carolina case is actually more directly on point. The Florida Supreme Court case, Lyons -- and we've highlighted it for the Court, but it says, clerical errors will not be permitted to defeat acknowledges -acknowledgments when they, considered either alone or in connection with the instrument acknowledged and viewed in light of the statute controling them, fairly show a substantial compliance with the statute.

The North Carolina case is a will case, In Re Will of Durham. And there it's exactly our case. The notary affidavit was silent as to whether the person was personally known or not. And the Court held the caveat was self-proving. The fact that the notary's affidavit is silent as to whether decedent was personally known to the notary or produced satisfactory evidence of his identity does not show a lack of compliance with the notary
statute, given the issues of personal knowledge or satisfactory evidence are simply not addressed in that affidavit.

So we have a Florida case and we have the North Carolina case, which I think is -- it's obviously not binding, but it is sort of persuasive. If they're self-proved, we would win without any further inquiry. The reason we had a trial and the reason we had to file a complaint was everything in this case -- you've slogged through the mud with us for a day, but we've been slogging through the mud for -- basically, I got directly involved in January of 2014, after the Tescher Spallina firm -- after the issues with the firm came to light. So we've been slogging through this.

But we did file a complaint. We went the next step. So the next step says to you, assume the notaries are invalid, which they aren't invalid; but if they were, all we need to establish these documents is the testimony of any attesting witness. So we put on the testimony of an attesting witness, Mr. Spallina. He testified to the preparation of the documents. And I do think it's relevant and it will give the Court comfort in
making findings of fact that there was an extensive set of meetings between Mr. Spallina and his clients when they did the documents.

I mean, we documented for the first set of documents, you know, four meetings, a letter with some drafts, then a meeting to sign the documents, some phone calls and some amending the documents. And in 2012, we've documented at least one meeting with notes involving Simon; telephone conferences between Simon and his client; eventually, when a decision was made, a conference call of all the children; drafts of the documents sent; the document being executed.

And so I think if you look at the evidence, the totality of the evidence, there's nothing to suggest that these five documents do not reflect the true intent of Simon and Shirley Bernstein. There's nothing to suggest that they weren't prepared by the law firm; that they weren't signed by the people that purport to sign them; that undisputed testimony from an attesting witness was that all three people were present, and it was signed by the testator and the two witnesses in the presence of each other.

So under either scenario, you get the document
admitted. In fact, the documents are in evidence. They've been admitted to probate. But the testimony under 732.502, 503, the testimony of the drafting attorney, who attested -- who was an attesting witness, is sufficient for these documents.

There's absolutely no evidence put on the Court that Simon Bernstein lacked mental capacity. In fact, the evidence is directly to the contrary. Every witness testified that he was mentally sharp; making intelligent decisions; having a conference call with his children to explain his wishes. And there's simply no evidence in the record to determine that he lacked testamentary capacity.

So if I have Mr. Bernstein, Simon Bernstein, with testamentary capacity signing documents in the presence of two subscribing witnesses, the 2012 documents should be upheld. I don't know if there's a question at all even about Shirley Bernstein's 2008 document, but the testimony is undisputed that the documents were consistent with her wishes. You saw a draft letter that explained to her exactly what was happening. She signed the documents. The self-proving affidavits for the Shirley documents are all checked perfectly. And
even if they weren't, we have an attesting witness here.

And, frankly, I think Eliot Bernstein likes these documents. And all he wants to do is argue what they mean and how much money you get from them. And we didn't really need to spend a day arguing this, but we have and we're here. And we believe that the evidence conclusively demonstrates that these documents are valid.

Now, you've heard some nonsense and some shenanigans. There were a couple of problems in the case; one with the notarization of documents. And it's sort of a sad and tortured story, but it's -- it was clearly wrong for someone to send documents into Judge Colin's courtroom that had been altered. The correct documents were submitted and the estate should have been closed.

And when the documents were returned, someone should have gone and filed a motion with Judge Colin to accept the un-notarized documents, since there was no dispute they were signed. And we wouldn't be here. But for whatever reason, that happened. And it's unfortunate that happened, but there's no evidence that Ted Bernstein, either of his sisters, or Eliot Bernstein, or any of the
grandchildren played any role in the fabrication of that document -- the false notarization.

The fabricated amendment to Shirley's trust document is a very disturbing fact, and we took immediate action to correct it. No one's purported to validate that document. We filed an action to have the Court construe the documents, tell us which are valid, tell us what they mean. And that's where we should be focusing our time on. And this is, in my view, step one toward that.

But if you look at the evidence we've presented, if you -- I understand you've got to deal with the witnesses that you're handed. And I think Mr. Spallina's testimony, notwithstanding the two issues that we addressed, was persuasive, it was unrebutted.

And we would ask that you uphold the five documents and determine, as we have pled, that the five testamentary documents that are in evidence, I believe, as 1, \(2,3,4\), and 5 be upheld and determined to be the valid and final testamentary documents of Simon and Shirley Bernstein. To the extent there's any question the document that has been admitted to be not genuine be determined to be an inoperative and ungenuine document, we would ask
that you enter judgment for us on Count II and reserve jurisdiction to deal with the rest of the issues as swiftly as we can.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Any closing argument from the other side?
Okay.
I keep forgetting that you've got a right to be heard, so please forgive me.

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, if I may approach, I have some case law and statutes that I may refer to. And I'll try to be brief and not cumulative.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Could I get the other case law that was submitted? Do you have a copy of that?

MR. ROSE: Sure.

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, the relevant statute with respect to the execution of wills is 732.502. It says that every will must be in writing and executed as follows. And I'll just recite from the relevant parts, that is to say relevant with respect to our case.

The testator must sign at the end of the will and it must be in the presence of at least two attesting witnesses. And if we drop down to Subsection C, the attesting witnesses must sign the will in the presence of the testator and in the
presence of each other.
Judge, that was established and uncontroverted in connection with Mr. Spallina's testimony. So 732.502 was complied with.

Now, I think that we -- there was kind of a distraction with respect to the self-proving affidavits at the end. As Your Honor's aware, a self-proving affidavit is of no consequence in connection with the execution of a will. Execution of a will as dealt with in 732.502 merely requires execution at the end by the testator or the testatrix, and then two witnesses who go ahead and attest as to the testator's signature.

Now, the self-proving affidavit at the end is in addition to. So the fact that there may or may not have been a proper notarization is of no consequence in connection with a determination of the validity of any of these documents. So that's number one.

Number two, I've also provided Your Honor with another -- a statutory section, 733.107, and it's titled "The Burden of Proof in Contest." And it says there, in Subsection 1, "In all proceedings contesting the validity of a will, the burden shall be upon the proponent of the will to establish,
prima facie, its formal execution and attestation."
I would submit to the Court that that was done today. We had Mr. Spallina's testimony, which was uncontroverted, that indicated that 732.502 was complied with. The statute goes on to state, "A self-proving affidavit executed in accordance with 733.502 or an oath of an attesting witness executed as required under the statutes is admissible and establishes, prima facie, the formal execution and attestation of the will."

So, once again, I would submit to the Court that there were self-proving affidavits with respect to all of these testamentary documents. They were proper in form, and therefore comply or comport with the second sentence of the statute. But even if not, we had Mr. Spallina testify today so as to comply with this second sentence of Subsection 1 .

So if we drop down to the third sentence of this Subsection 1, it says that, "Thereafter, the contestant shall have the burden of establishing the grounds on which probate of the will is opposed or revocation is sought."

That was not done today by Mr. Eliot
Bernstein. He did not present any evidence or meet
any burden to overturn these valid wills.
Judge, there is the competency argument. The testamentary competency, I'm now going to quote from In Re Wilmott's Estate, 66 So.2d 465. "A testamentary competency means the ability to understand generally the nature and extent of one's property, the relationship of those who would be the natural objects of the testator's bounty, and the practical effect of the will."

The only testimony, I elicited that from Mr. Spallina. His is the only testimony that we have in this regard. And it's uncontroverted that both of these decedents met those very specific criteria which -- with respect to each and every one of the five documents that are submitted for your Court's validation today.

There's also case law, In Re Estate of Weihe, W-E-I-H-E. That's 268 So.2d 446. That's a Fourth DCA case that says, "Competency is generally presumed and the burden of proving incompetency is on the contestant." So even if we didn't have Mr. Spallina's testimony today, which I elicited, competency on the part of both Shirley and Si Bernstein would be presumed. And it would be the contestant, Mr. Eliot Bernstein, who would have to
come up with the -- or would have the burden of showing that they were incompetent. He presented no evidence today in that regard or in that respect.

Lastly, there's the In Re Carnegie's estate, 153 Florida 7. It's a 1943 case. That says that testamentary capacity refers to competency at the time that the will was executed, so on that date.

The only testimony we have with respect to any issues of competency on the date -- on the specific dates that these testamentary documents were signed was from Mr. Spallina. And on all such dates and times, Mr. Spallina testified that these requisites with respect to competency -- or testamentary competency were met.

Finally, Judge, undue influence, that would be a reason for invalidating a will. Mr. Bernstein, once again, did not present any evidence to go ahead and suggest that these wills or trusts documents should be overturned on the grounds of undue influence. And in that regard, I provided Your Honor with the Estate of Carpenter, 253 So. 2d 697. To prove undue influence, one must demonstrate that a beneficiary had a confidential relationship with the decedent and actively
procured the will or trust.
Mr. Eliot Bernstein did not even suggest today that any of the beneficiaries actively procured the document. Why? Beneficiaries are essentially -are ultimately the ten grandchildren.

Mr. Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein, did not suggest today that any one of the ten grandchildren, who are ultimately beneficiaries, were active in procuring any of the five documents, nor did Mr. Bernstein submit to the Court any evidence of confidential relationship by anyone in connection with the various criteria to raise the presumption of undue influence, nor did Eliot Bernstein raise the presumption by satisfying any or enough of the criteria under the Carpenter case to go ahead and raise the presumption that anyone, any substantial beneficiary, had committed undue influence with respect to any of these documents.

For those various, multifarious reasons, Judge, I would submit to the Court that these documents are valid and should be held as such.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
Any closing from the defendant's side?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, yeah.
THE COURT: You've got eight minutes
remaining.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Your Honor, we're really here today because of a complex fraud on the court and on beneficiaries like myself and my children. The only witness they procured to validate these documents has consented to the SEC and felony charges recently with his partner for insider trading. He came up on the stand and admitted that he committed fraud, and that his law firm forged documents and frauded documents, and then submitted them not only to the court, but beneficiaries' attorneys as part of a very complex fraud to not only change beneficiaries, but to seize dominion and control of the estates through these very contestable documents.

They've been shown by the governor's office to not be properly notarized. The two people who are going -- well, one is --

MR. ROSE: I don't want to object to --
MR. BERNSTEIN: -- has no --

MR. ROSE: Can I object? He's so far talking about things that aren't in evidence.

THE COURT: Sustained.

You can only argue those things that were received in evidence.

MR. ROSE: And I realize Your Honor has a good memory of the evidence --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I put in evidence that Mr. Spallina was SEC --

THE COURT: No, I sustained objections to those questions.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: You can only argue those things that came into evidence.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. They didn't bring in any of the necessary parties to validate these documents, other than Mr. Spallina, who admitted to the Court today that he fraudulently altered the trust document. Can \(I\) now say that?

THE COURT: It's not good for you to ask me questions. I've got to rule on objections, and I'm trying to give you some guidance so that you don't screw up. But I can't answer your legal questions.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. So the only witness has admitted in this very case that his law firm submitted forged and fraudulent documents to the Court already in this case; that he himself did those frauds. And we're relying on his sole testimony.

None of the other people who signed these
documents are here today to validate or even confirm his statements. So it's a highly uncredible [sic] witness to the documents, especially when Mr. Spallina drafted, signed as a witness, gained interest in the documents himself personally as a trustee, and seems to clearly have then taken it upon himself to mislead beneficiaries as to the actual documents.

I have asked for production of these documents. Today there were no originals produced to this Court for you to examine.

And more importantly, there's a few last things I wanted to state to the Court. My children are not represented here today as beneficiaries. They were supposed to be represented by a trustee of a trust that does not exist in our possession. So they were -- I was sued as a trustee of a trust I've never been given to represent my children, who are alleged beneficiaries by these guys. And the estate's done nothing to provide counsel to three minor children, and left them here today without counsel, and me as a trustee of a trust that doesn't exist, as far as we know. I've never signed it. They haven't submitted it to the Court, to anybody.

I want to bring up Rule 1.20, pretrial procedure, case management conference process provides, "The matter to be considered shall be specified in the order of notice setting the conference."

So I just want to say that we had a status conference in Simon Bernstein's estate, and only Simon Bernstein's estate, and that this trial was scheduled in Simon's status conference, which violates that very rule. So this trial, in my view, was conducted improperly.

Like I said, if you look at the hearing transcript of that day, you'll see that Mr. Rose misleads the Court to think that all these cases were noticed up that day. But Mr. O'Connell, the PR, had only noticed it up for Simon's estate. So what I'm doing here at a trial in Shirley's trust violates Rule 1.20.

There are some other things that are violated and not -- I believe we didn't get to discuss the -- at the case management, the fact that, you know -- and I did try to get this out -- that we would need a lot more time for a competency hearing, for a removal of Ted process, which should have come first before doing this and letting them
argue, where it's been alleged that there's some serious problems with Ted Bernstein's representation, including the fact that the \(P R\) of the estate of Simon has filed with this Court notice that he's not a valid trustee.

MR. ROSE: Objection. Outside -- not in evidence.

THE COURT: Okay. If you're not going to argue the facts that are in evidence in this trial, then I'm going to ask you to stop.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Well, I'll keep going on my -- see, that's what's confusing. What trial? We had a case management. I was prepared for a Simon, where I have Simon trust construction, all those things ready, and I didn't come with any notes about Shirley. And I've tried to notice the Court that under 1.200, this trial was scheduled improperly in the estate of Simon, and should have been reheard or rescheduled or something.

But that seems not to matter. It doesn't matter that we follow the rules. I follow the rules, but it seems that the other side doesn't follow any of the rules; doesn't submit documents properly to courts; commits frauds on courts; and then wants you to believe the validity of these
documents based on a felony statement to the Court, who's under a consent with the SEC.

THE COURT: You've got two minutes remaining.
MR. BERNSTEIN: There were outstanding discovery requests. I was denied all these documents. I was denied the trust that I'm sued under representing my children. So I can't get any of those documents. We would have brought all that up at a real status conference had it been a real status conference and not a corralling or, as you called it, a wrangling of octopuses.

THE COURT: That's vivid imagery. Isn't it? I pride myself on that one.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Oh, yeah. Well, I was wrangled, technically, into the wrong case here today, in a status conference that you should have corrected upon learning about this. And Mr. Rose has been aware of his mistake in misleading the Court that all these cases were noticed up, when they weren't. And he didn't come to the Court to correct it. Kind of like they didn't come to the Court to correct the validity of these documents before acting under them, knowing they needed to be not only challenged on validity, but on construction of terms, which will come next, which
is going to just go right back into the same circle of fraud.

So their star witness is a felon. Their star witness has committed fraud upon this Court in this case. That's who they're relying on, and hoping you bank on his words to validate documents.

I, Your Honor, am asking that you don't validate the documents; that we move forward to have the documents properly forensically analyzed.

They were the subject of ongoing criminal investigations, which are just getting kicked off. In fact, I got 7200 documents from Mr. Spallina, where almost, I think, 7200 are fraud.

THE COURT: Your time is more than elapsed. I was letting you finish up as a courtesy, but you're getting off into things that aren't in evidence --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. Well, I don't think the trial was conducted fairly. I think that my due process rights have been denied under the law.

THE COURT: Your time is more than up. Thank you.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Is there any rebuttal?
MR. BERNSTEIN: And I still would like to move for your disqualification, on the record.

THE COURT: On the record doesn't count.
You've got to put it in writing.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Are you sure? I thought I saw in the rules --

THE COURT: I'll tell you what. You proceed under your understanding of the law and the rules. That's fine.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Before I take this --

MR. BERNSTEIN: I rest.
THE COURT: -- before \(I\) take this rebuttal argument, I'll let you put your request for recusal in writing. We'll be out of session five minutes. Is that something you want me to read? MR. ROSE: I just want to make my final -THE COURT: I just want to make sure that there's been no possibility that this gentleman won't have his moment to shine.

So go ahead and go put that in writing, sir.
Be back in five minutes.
(A break was taken.)
THE COURT: Did you get that written down?
MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I approach?
THE COURT: Sure. All approaches are okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Do you want to wait for
everybody?
THE COURT: Do you have something that you wanted to file, a written motion to recuse?

MR. BERNSTEIN: Yeah. In freestyle.
THE COURT: All right. I'll take a look at it. Thank you.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Can I ask a question?
THE COURT: I'll be in recess. I'll take a look at this written motion. Thank you. It'll take me just a minute. Don't anybody go away. (A break was taken.)

THE COURT: The stack of documents handed up to me by the defendant are duplicates of documents that he filed, it looks like, twice with the clerk on December 4th, and they've already been ruled upon by me. But I am also ruling today by handwritten order on the face of one of the documents that the disqualification motion is denied as legally insufficient; already ruled upon in the order of 12/8/15, at Docket Entry No. 98; identical to motions filed by defendant on 12/4/2015 at Docket Entries Nos. 94 and 98; done in order of John Phillips, 12/15/15. And since I have skills, \(I\) made copies of my handwritten order for everybody.

Gary, if you could, just hand these out.
That'll take care of all that.
Now we can go back to talking about the case. I was going to take the rebuttal argument from Plaintiff's side. I'd take that now.

MR. ROSE: I have just the exhibits that we put in evidence on the plaintiff's side, if that's easier for the Court.

THE COURT: That would be much easier. Thank you.

MR. ROSE: And I have a proposed final judgment. And I wanted to talk about one paragraph of the final judgment in particular.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't had time to review any final judgment or anything.

THE COURT: You're interrupting the argument. Thank you.

MR. ROSE: So the complaint alleges -- and I realize we didn't cover every issue in the entire case, but we do it within the four corners of Count II of the complaint. Count II of the complaint was stated in paragraph 79 through 88 of the complaint.

And the answer that's filed in this case on Count II at paragraph 80 alleges that there's been a fraud on the court by Ted Bernstein, including,
but not limited to, proven forgery, fraudulent notarizations, fraud on the court, altercation [sic] of trust documents, et cetera, et cetera. And in paragraph 82, the answer says that Ted should be removed for his ongoing involvement in fraud which is dealing with these documents.

Ted Bernstein is serving as a fiduciary. You've heard -- that was the defense to this case. That's stated in the complaint. You heard no evidence that Ted Bernstein was involved in the preparation or creation of any fraudulent documents. In fact, the evidence from Mr. Spallina was to the contrary.

So our final judgment in paragraph 5 asks the Court to make a ruling on the issues that are pled in the answer, specifically that there was no evidence that Ted was involved and that the evidence was to the contrary.

So we have no rebuttal. We believe we've established our case, and we proposed a final judgment for Your Honor's consideration that discusses that this is an action to adjudicate five documents to be the testamentary documents. Based on the evidence presented, they're genuine, authentic, valid and enforceable; has the requisite
findings. Paragraph 5, which I've explained, the reason we believe it's appropriate in the final judgment, given the pleadings that were made and the lack of evidence on those pleadings. And we didn't get into it today, but --

THE COURT: Well, if we didn't get into it today, then it's not proper for argument.

MR. ROSE: Well, it's alleged in the complaint and not proven, so I think it's appropriate to make
a finding on it. You didn't actually hear testimony that was relevant to those issues about Ted Bernstein. And I would ask you to consider that 5 is supported by the evidence and the pleadings.

And 6, we would like you to declare the unauthorized one invalid, because it does change potentially something, and we want to know what we're doing going forward. And I don't think anyone disputes that Exhibit 6 that's in evidence was not valid. And then it just states this is intended to be a final order under the rules of probate code.

So that's our order. We would ask you to enter our judgment or a judgment similar to it; find in favor of the plaintiff; reserve
jurisdiction for numerous other matters that we need to deal with as quickly as we can. But, hopefully, with the guidance we get today, we'll be able to do it more quickly and more efficiently. So thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
We'll be in recess. It was fun spending time with you all.

Sir, do you have any proposed final judgment you want me to consider? I've received one from the plaintiff's side. Is there some from the defendant's side?

MR. BERNSTEIN: No. I haven't received one from them. And seeing theirs --

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
Then we'll be in recess. Thank you all very much. I'll get this order out as quickly as \(I\) can.
(At 4:48 p.m. the trial was concluded.)
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IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA PROBATE DIVISION
CASE NO, 502012CP004391XXXXSB

IN RE:
ESTATE OF SIMON L, BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE,
Petitioner,
vs.
TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (and all
parties, associates and of counsel); ROBERT L, SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R, TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN
(as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

\section*{Respondents.}

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE
HONORABLE MARTIN H. COLIN VOLUME II
- - -

DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2014
TIME: 2:30 P.M. - 5:03 P.M.



\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 61 & & & 63 \\
\hline 1 & creditor is not permitted to bring this action. & 1 & understand how William Stansbury can say there is & \\
\hline 2 & The authority for that -- let me state what the & 2 & a conflict that Eliot doesn't say exists. & \\
\hline 3 & authority is. Privity is required for someone to & 3 & MR. FEAMAN: Mr. Stansbury is harmed as a & \\
\hline 4 & try to go up to an attorney and say you can't & 4 & result of the apparent dereliction of & \\
\hline 5 & represent Ted Bernstein. There is no privity & 5 & Mr. Pankauski's duties to Mr. Eliot Bernstein & \\
\hline 6 & here. There is no attorney-client relationship & 6 & because -- & \\
\hline 7 & between my firm and the creditor, Mr. Stansbury. & 7 & THE COURT: Even if Eliot doesn't complain? & \\
\hline 8 & The authority for that is a 2012 Second District & 8 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 9 & case called THI Holdings, Thomas Howard Indigo & 9 & THE COURT: Okay. Show me - I need a case & \\
\hline 10 & Holdings, LLC. And it sets forth that privity is & 10 & that says that that's possible. Because that's & \\
\hline 11 & required. It involved a motion to disqualify, a & 11 & what I don't see. Eliot, I think, can complain, & \\
\hline 12 & motion for pro hac vice. And it says here as a & 12 & and I'm not sure that it's -- which rule applies. & \\
\hline 13 & matter of undisputed facts, there is no privity & 13 & MR. FEAMAN: And he may yet complain, we & \\
\hline 14 & between the estate and Balassa or his firm. And & 14 & don't know. And I can't -- & \\
\hline 15 & it goes on to talk about that. And then it says & 15 & THE COURT: Right. & \\
\hline 16 & even if the estate could convince this court that & 16 & MR. FEAMAN: -- speak for Eliot. & \\
\hline 17 & it had standing to raise the disqualification & 17 & THE COURT: I know. Eliot is representing & \\
\hline 18 & issue, it cannot establish the legal requirements & 18 & himself. & \\
\hline 19 & for disqualification. & 19 & MR. FEAMAN: Nor do I prepare pleadings for & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: So here's the thing that's & 20 & Mr. Bernstein. & \\
\hline 21 & concerning me, Mr. Feaman. The allegation, & 21 & THE COURT: Eliot went so far as to sign your & \\
\hline 22 & looking at the motion, is that there was -- l'm & 22 & verification, but it's not his motion. That's one & \\
\hline 23 & using this expression broadly -- some legal & 23 & problem. But also -- I'm almost positive because & \\
\hline 24 & dealings between Eliot Bernstein and the Pankauski & 24 & of some prior cases I had that the person who has & \\
\hline 25 & firm. That's what you allege, correct? & 25 & to complain is -- about a lawyer representing & \\
\hline & 62 & & & 64 \\
\hline 1 & MR. FEAMAN: Correct. & 1 & someone else, and in this case it's Mr. Pankauski & \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: So - and Eliot Bernstein has & 2 & continuing to represent Ted Bernstein, is the & \\
\hline 3 & not -- and then we also know that Ted Bernstein & 3 & person who purportedly is the benefactor of these & \\
\hline 4 & has hired Mr. Pankauski, that same lawyer that & 4 & rules as an either prospective or former client. & \\
\hline 5 & Eliot says he had legal dealings with. True? & 5 & But if he says no -- if he doesn't seek & \\
\hline 6 & MR. FEAMAN: True. & 6 & disqualification, I'm not sure how someone else & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: So here's what I'm just not & 7 & can -- has an interest, under the cases that I & \\
\hline 8 & following you -- almost like a matter of logic. & 8 & read, for that to happen. Let me just look here & \\
\hline 9 & With Eliot not complaining, how can a creditor or & 9 & if there is a case I just saw in my research. & \\
\hline 10 & any other outside person who doesn't claim a & 10 & MR. FEAMAN: The court -- & \\
\hline 11 & conflict of interest -- say I don't want & 11 & THE COURT: I did an extensive case right on & \\
\hline 12 & Mr. Pankauski to continue to represent Ted when & 12 & Rule 4-1.9, very similar to this, and it was -- & \\
\hline 13 & Eliot has not filed the motion complaining because & 13 & everyone said it was that rule, not the & \\
\hline 14 & Eliot is the other purported either prospective or & 14 & prospective rule. Although, from reading your & \\
\hline 15 & former client, depending upon which rule you look & 15 & motion, it's almost the identical type of case. & \\
\hline 16 & at - who has a right to either complain or not. & 16 & And both lawyers in that case said, though, that & \\
\hline 17 & So l'm sure it's not the case in reality, but if & 17 & it was the 4-1.9 that applied not the 4-1.8. But & \\
\hline 18 & Eliot didn't complain -- I mean, it could be that & 18 & the moving party was the alleged aggrieved party & \\
\hline 19 & Eliot is taking a position, you know, whatever I & 19 & who said that they -- that the other lawyer had a & \\
\hline 20 & did with Mr. Pankauski and his firm, you know, it & 20 & conflict of interest because the other lawyer & \\
\hline 21 & started where it started, ended where it ended, & 21 & here, Mr. Pankauski, had performed some & \\
\hline 22 & and, you know, it may be that Ted hired him and & 22 & lawyer-client services, and there was other & \\
\hline 23 & that's okay with me. And I'm not asking that & 23 & information that led to the -- because if there is & \\
\hline 24 & Mr. Pankauski not represent Ted because of some & 24 & no attorney-client relationship that is complained & \\
\hline 25 & conflict with me, Eliot. I don't -- I just don't & 25 & about that Eliot says was breached, I'm not sure & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 65 & & & 67 \\
\hline 1 & that William has standing. And I just -- I mean, & 1 & can do or not do. That's not what's involved & \\
\hline 2 & if you have a case that says he does... & 2 & here. So here when -- Eliot was first in time, & \\
\hline 3 & MR. FEAMAN: Only thing I have is the comment & 3 & right? & \\
\hline 4 & to 4-1.7-- & 4 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: Okay. & 5 & THE COURT: You agree with that? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. FEAMAN: -- which deals with conflicts of & 6 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes. & \\
\hline 7 & interest. & 7 & THE COURT: So Eliot sees Mr. Pankauski, or & \\
\hline 8 & THE COURT: Sure. Let me see. & 8 & his office does what he does -- we may be talking & \\
\hline 9 & MR. FEAMAN: And it's at the end in the & 9 & about that in a few moments. And then the & \\
\hline 10 & book - I don't know if you have the book. & 10 & question becomes where Mr. Pankauski then & \\
\hline 11 & THE COURT: I have the book, yeah. & 11 & continues to -- or chooses to represent someone & \\
\hline 12 & MR. FEAMAN: On Page -- I have the 2013 & 12 & else, Ted Bernstein, it looks like Rule 4-1.18, & \\
\hline 13 & edition. & 13 & subsection (c) applies. A lawyer subject to & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Okay. & 14 & subdivision (b) shall not represent a client with & \\
\hline 15 & MR. FEAMAN: Page 1985. & 15 & interest materially adverse to those of a & \\
\hline 16 & THE COURT: Wait a minute. My Rule 4-1.8 the & 16 & prospective client in the same or substantially & \\
\hline 17 & comments are on a different page, but what's the & 17 & related matter. And it goes on to talk about & \\
\hline 18 & heading of the comment? & 18 & that. & \\
\hline 19 & MR. FEAMAN: Conflict charge by an opposing & 19 & So is that the rule that you say applies? & \\
\hline 20 & party. & 20 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 21 & THE COURT: Okay. Got that. Let me read it. & 21 & THE COURT: You agree that rule would apply? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. FEAMAN: It says, the second sentence, in & 22 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 23 & litigation a court may raise the question when & 23 & THE COURT: I think Rule 4-1.9, which is the & \\
\hline 24 & there is reason to infer that the lawyer has & 24 & other conflict of interest rule, is where -- & \\
\hline 25 & neglected the responsibility. & 25 & arises where there actually is a situation where & \\
\hline & 66 & & & 68 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: Okay. Let me read the entire -- & 1 & Eliot Bernstein is then called a former client, & \\
\hline 2 & what subsection of 4-1.8 do you say applies, & 2 & and then Mr. Pankauski would represent Ted. And & \\
\hline 3 & Mr. Feaman? & 3 & then subsection (a) there almost uses the exact & \\
\hline 4 & MR. FEAMAN: Well, our motion speaks to & 4 & same language. & \\
\hline 5 & 4-1.18. & 5 & So l'm not sure if Eliot is a former & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: Eighteen. Okay. Say that again & 6 & client or a prospective client, but if he's & \\
\hline 7 & 4 -- & 7 & first in line, then the rule is almost & \\
\hline 8 & MR. FEAMAN: 4-1.18. & 8 & identical about when Mr. Pankauski then can & \\
\hline 9 & THE COURT: Let me look at that, it's & 9 & represent Ted Bernstein in the same or & \\
\hline 10 & different. & 10 & related -- substantially related matter. The & \\
\hline 11 & Okay. That's duties to prospective & 11 & language is the same, true? & \\
\hline 12 & client. Let's read. & 12 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 13 & MR. FEAMAN: Right. & 13 & THE COURT: You agree? & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Let me read that. & 14 & MR. FEAMAN: True. & \\
\hline 15 & MR. FEAMAN: Okay. & 15 & THE COURT: All right. So let me get passed, & \\
\hline 16 & THE COURT: Let me look at the comments for a & 16 & though, the procedural aspect as to whether & \\
\hline 17 & second. & 17 & William can bring that without -- William & \\
\hline 18 & Okay. So I think there is maybe a little & 18 & Stansbury - can bring this complaint in & \\
\hline 19 & overlap here. If Eliot Bernstein is a & 19 & connection with the motion to disqualify when & \\
\hline 20 & prospective client, the way the rule starts, & 20 & Eliot doesn't. If Eliot is the purported party & \\
\hline 21 & there is a focus about when he purportedly & 21 & who is harmed by the potential conflicts of & \\
\hline 22 & consults with Mr. Pankauski and he's a & 22 & interest, either as a prospective client of & \\
\hline 23 & prospective client, if Mr. Pankauski has some & 23 & Mr. Pankauski or former client, if it got that & \\
\hline 24 & lawyer-client relationship with someone else at & 24 & & \\
\hline 25 & the time, then there are rules that say what he & 25 & MR. FEAMAN: Our argument, Your Honor, on & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
behalf of Mr. Stansbury, is that because Eliot Bernstein's interests are more closely aligned with Mr. Stansbury's, and are clearly adverse to Ted Bernstein, and Mr. Stansbury's interests are clearly adverse to Ted Bernstein, that if Eliot Bernstein transmitted information as a prospective client to the attorney who's now Ted Bernstein's lawyer, and we're adverse to him, it's our position that we're harmed as a result of that.

THE COURT: Well - but it's not harm that's -- the rule is not a harm. The rule is a conflict of interest. And the conflict of interest has to be between Eliot and Ted. I'm not sure how it could be otherwise.

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, as a result of that conflict of interest --

THE COURT: Well, okay. But I still have to --

MR. FEAMAN: -- we're hurt.
THE COURT: But if Eliot says -- because there could be waivers, says here in the rule --4-1.9 says a lawyer who has formerly represented a client shall not thereafter represent another person, okay, uniess -- and then there's unlesses [sic] -- and one of those things are clearly in
this case Eliot could not complain about it.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: May I interject, Your Honor?

THE COURT: You're objecting?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No, can I interject?
THE COURT: What do you want to say?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I politely asked him and told him that he was conflicted, and I felt harmed by it.

THE COURT: That's evidence, though. That's potential evidence you want to interject, but you haven't filed this motion.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I didn't learn that until yesterday, so if I have to, I'll do another day.

THE COURT: So let me ask this. If -- the motion is filed, it's in written form, it's filed by Mr. Stansbury. I think it needs to be joined, if not independently, at least joined by Eliot Bernstein. So what's your position -- and that's clearly what Eliot wants to do, he just doesn't know it yet. What about that, Mr. Pankauski? Can I treat this motion and go forward based upon it being joined by Eliot?

MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. Mr. Eliot

Bernstein received notice of that. He's chosen to go without counsel. He's chosen not to seek any affirmative relief.

THE COURT: But that -- that's to the case. But I'm talking about the motion to disqualify you.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, that's what I am speaking about.

THE COURT: So I mean -- I could do one of two things. I can tell Eliot go over to the library and start writing out -- Xeroxing this motion, sign it yourself, and bring it in, and then, you know --

MR. PANKAUSKI: You just want an oral joinder right now?

THE COURT: Yeah --
MR. PANKAUSKI: That's fine.
THE COURT: -- that's what I'm getting at.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes. Sorry, Judge.
THE COURT: Okay. What's your position on that?

MR. PANKAUSKI: But Mr. Stansbury can't do
it. Eliot could do it.
THE COURT: I think Eliot needs to be the complaining party. Now, I'm not saying you can't
participate as counsel to maybe help steer the evidence. I'm probably thinking that would be okay, but I think we need Eliot to join.
Mr. Pankauski doesn't have an objection. What do you say?

MR. FEAMAN: I have no objection to Mr. Eliot
Bernstein joining. I'm just not going to be in a position of encouraging him to do something and violate my neutrality.

THE COURT: You are not -- you don't represent him.

MR. FEAMAN: That's correct.
THE COURT: So Eliot is pro se.
MR. FEAMAN: Correct.
THE COURT: You know, there is a burden that is on Eliot to start, but since he's joining your motion, I'm going to allow -- just because for judicial economy and so we don't have to like come back on this matter and everyone is ready to go forward -- for you to help, almost be second chair counsel, standby counsel, although, I know you represent William, to just help bring out the evidence. So I'm going to allow that.

Okay. So Eliot, this is your motion.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.

THE COURT: So come on up and sit here so I can look at you and Judge your credibility when I hear things that are going on. So sit right there in the middle.

So whether -- again, I'm not -- I'm not sure, I won't know til the end, what rule I think this comes under, but it looks like it's either 1-9-- or 1.9 or 1.18 , but it sounds like it's one of those two.

So, okay, so you're up first.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you. I would call
Mr. Eliot Bernstein to the stand.
THE COURT: I figured that would be first.
Okay. Come on, Eliot.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Opening statements.
THE COURT: He has a right to opening. So have a seat here and I'll let Mr. Pankauski finish his opening.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Thanks, Judge. And I -okay. Thank you, Your Honor. So concisely, we are traveling -- and I agree with Mr. Stansbury's counsel -- under 4-1.18. The evidence is going to show that my firm never had an attorney-client relationship with Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

And if I may, let's just -- we've dealt
with the standing issue of Mr. Stansbury. You know, I'm of the position he does not have standing. I'm also of the position that Eliot lacks standing to participate in this estate administration. He's not a beneficiary under the decedent's will. He's not a beneficiary under the decedent's revocable trust.

I do recognize that I'm coming in late to this estate administration.

Eliot Bernstein is not an interested person in this estate. He shouldn't even be here.

So 1 need to --
THE COURT: What is Eliot Bernstein other than the brother of Ted?

MR. PANKAUSKI: Nothing.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. PANKAUSKI: I mean, if this was a guardianship, he may have standing to come in and participate in the administration of his dad's person and property, but it's an estate. He totally lacks standing. And because he lacks standing, he doesn't -- he's not an interested person and can't come in and tell Ted Bernstein who he can hire as an attorney for an estate
administration.
And that's my third point, Your Honor. This isn't an adverse lawsuit. This isn't a personal injury case. Mr. Ted Bernstein has asked Your Honor if he can administer this estate. He wants to be a fiduciary. As he is a fiduciary --

THE COURT: Okay. But the participation of Ted is not questioned. It's whether you can do it for him.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood.
THE COURT: So Ted is -- no one is suggesting
Ted is not eligible to request that he be a PR or curator. I mean, that wasn't objected to yesterday.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Understood. And so, if I may, let me go to the standard that we're traveling under today and what we should be doing here. Because we are going to introduce evidence that there was no attorney-client relationship. Evidence is going to be introduced that there was no confidential information that Eliot Bernstein conveyed to my law firm. The evidence is going to show that he called up trying to find an attorney to sue Don Tescher for malpractice regarding some
estate matters of his parents.
I'm going to testify about
Mr. Bernstein's - excuse me -- about Mr. Stansbury's verified motion. I'm going to testify as to what Mr. Stansbury's counsel told me out there yesterday when you asked me to step out. And l'm going to demonstrate the amazing amount of inconsistencies in this fiction that we had an attorney-client relationship, or there is some type of confidential information that is going to be adverse to Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

So it's a three-fold test or three-prong test, Your Honor. For you to disqualify this firm -- for you to say Ted Bernstein, you can not hire the Pankauski law firm for estate administration. You would have first to make a finding of fact that the interests of Ted Bernstein are materially adverse, not just adverse, but materially adverse to the prospective client, Eliot Bernstein.

The second thing that you would need to find is that I received confidential information from Mr. Eliot Bernstein.

And then the third thing that you would
have to find is that I am going to use that information, that confidential information, to the disadvantage of Mr. Eliot Bernstein in an estate.

THE COURT: That you are going to or could?
I mean, it couldn't be going to --
MR. PANKAUSKI: That I could. Thank you, Your Honor.

So that's the standard under 4-1.18. What does our Fourth District say about this?

THE COURT: I kind of want opening and not closing. So I got that part.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Okay. So the standard that I
would direct our attention to is the Coolis
(phonetic) case. You would need to find -- and
again, it's a finding of fact - - that I had actual knowledge of material confidential information. What the Fourth has described as protected information. The burden is on Eliot.

Finally, because disqualification of a
party's counsel is such an egregious
punishment, that we can't resort to
speculation. Mr. Eliot Bernstein needs to
prove by a greater weight of the evidence those
three prongs that I described in 4-1.18.
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Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Okay. All right. Let's get the evidence. Then we can talk about the law once we see what the evidence is.

Okay. Raise your right hand.
(Thereupon, ELIOT BERNSTEIN was duly sworn
by the court)
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Thank you. Please state your name.
A Eliot Ivan Bernstein.
Q Your residence address?
A 2753 NW 34th Street, Boca Raton, Florida.
Q And you are the son of the late Simon
Bernstein?
A Iam.
Q And you reside in Florida presently?
A Ido.
Q And are your children beneficiaries under the
estate as it presently is structured?
A I'm not a hundred percent sure at this point.
Q Okay.
A I believelam.
THE COURT: So do this, though. That may be true, but let's make sure you're asked a question,
\(4 \quad \mathrm{Q}\) is your brother Ted Bernstein presently a
beneficiary under the trust established by the estate
documents, if you know?
A Idon't believe so.
Q That would be Ted Bernstein?
A That would be.
Q And are your interests with Ted Bernstein
adverse in connection with the estate of Simon Bernstein?
A Yes, sir.
Q And how so?
A Well, I'm pursuing Ted in a number of legal
actions, criminal actions, for --
THE COURT: So focus on the question. Okay.
He didn't ask anything about criminal actions.
So, you know, you're a witness now --
THE WITNESS: We're adverse to each other.
THE COURT: You need to pay -- let me
finish -- you need to pay attention carefully to the question. Listen. Let me finish.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
THE COURT: Okay. And not ramble outside the scope of the question. Because Mr. Feaman's
don't volunteer, because that's important. Okay.
THE WITNESS: Sure.
BY MR. FEAMAN
questions are designed to be tailormade for this
case.
Go ahead.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Thank you, Your Honor.
How is your interest in the estate of your
father directly, or through the trust, established by
your father's will, in conflict with that of Ted
Bernstein?
A I believe we're at conflict because Ted and I
differ if Ted and his children are part of the estates.
Q Okay. And what do you believe - what is your
understanding, as you sit here today, as to whether Ted
and his children -- whether they should inherit under the
estate, what is your understanding?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection. Lack of foundation.

THE COURT: I'll let you cross on that, or it
may be brought out by his answer. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe they should be.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q And have you had discussions with Ted
concerning this?
A Yes.
Q And has Ted Bernstein disagreed with you?
```

A Yes.
Q How so? What has he indicated to you?
A He believes his children should be included
in the estate
Q Do you disagree with that?
A Ido.
Q And did you, in September of last year,
approach, with your wife, the law offices of
Mr. Pankauski?
A Yes, sir.
Q Do you recall about when that was?
A September 20th or so, around that area.
Q And was the approach in person or by phone?
A Byphone.
Q Okay. And who called?
A I believe my wife initiated the call.
Q Okay. Were you present when she made the phone
call?
A I don't believe so.
Q Okay. And how long did she -- withdrawn. As a
result of that phone call, was there an e-mail sent to
your -- to Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes,sir
Q Do you know to whom it was sent?
A I believe to Mr. Pankauski and his assistant,

```
Michelle Morley.
        MR. PANKAUSKI: Objection, speculation. He's
    believing.
        THE COURT: Okay. Try to avoid belief, tell
        me what you know. Can you reanswer?
            THE WITNESS: Yes. We sent information to
    both Mr. Pankauski and his assistant.
BY MR. FEAMAN
    Q And were you -- did your wife send an e-mail as
a follow-up to that telephone conversation?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. And were you copied on that e-mail?
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. Let me show you what's been marked as
Exhibit \(A\), ask you if this is a true copy of the e-mail
that was sent by your wife, in which you were copied
after the initial conversation that she had with
Mr. Pankauski's office?
    THE COURT: So just -- because I think I have
    the Exhibit \(A\) at the top part of that doesn't
    apply, correct? Because that's February 10th.
    MR, FEAMAN: Correct.
    THE COURT: So if the other -- your question
    is, what did Candice send. But this is an e-mail
    from Michelle. So it doesn't -- the e-mail
doesn't fit the question
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. Thank you. Hold on.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Are you aware that your wife sent an e-mail to
Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes.
Q And after that e-mail, did you personally have
a conversation with Mr. Pankauski's office?
A Yes.
Q With whom did you speak?
A Mr. Pankauski.
Q Directly?
A Yes.
Q Was this by telephone?
A Yes.
Q For how long?
A An hour or so.
Q Was this shortly after -- or within a few days
after the e-mail was sent by your wife?
A Yes, sir.
Q And was he in possession of documents that had
been transmitted by your wife to him?
A Yes, sir.
Q And did you discuss with Mr. Pankauski anything
that you would consider to be confidential?

\section*{A Yeah, confidential and adverse to the} information about my brother.

Q Like what?
A Like what we thought about my brother's
actions with the other attorneys. The fact that there
was forgery going on. We believed he was working with
the attorneys who resigned yesterday, Tescher and
Spallina. That Tescher and Spallina had brought them
in, had business dealings, et cetera. We gave him a
lot of confidential information, I feel.
Q Did you discuss Mr. Pankauski's law firm
representing you?
A Yes, sir.
Q And was a retainer asked for?
A It was.
Q And what were the terms of the retainer that
you recall?
A To -- he wanted us to pay money and to retain
his services. And we couldn't afford it. And I
basically told him we couldn't afford it.
THE COURT: That's not the question.
THE WITNESS: Oh, okay. Yeah, a retainer was
sought.
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q Was a retainer discussed?
    presently have at that time?
    A Yes.
    Q And did you set about to try to obtain the
retainer?
    A I told him I would try to get it from the
court, and make a petition to the court, which I filed
with the court. And l've been waiting for an answer on
that. And then I would have called him back and got
the money for him.
    Q All right. Did you ever receive any
    communication from Mr. Pankauski saying he was
    affirmatively not going to represent you?
    A No.
    Q When did you hear that Mr. Pankauski had been
retained by Mr. Ted Bernstein?
    A Oh, week or two ago.
    Q And did you review the notice of appearance
that was filed by Mr. Pankauski in this case?
    A I did.
    Q When did you receive that?
    A Oh, no, I don't think I've ever reviewed a
notice of appearance from him.
    Q Okay. And when you found out that

Mr. Pankauski was coming in on behalf of Mr. Ted
Bernstein, what was your reaction?
A I contacted him and said that I felt that he
was conflicted. And -- that was the first contact.
Q Did you send him an e-mail in that regard?
A Idid.
Q And did you express any desire that he not
represent Mr. Bernstein?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. And what was his response?
A He didn't see eye to eye with me, basically.
I sent him then the Bar rules that I felt applied, as a
follow-up e-mail. Then, you know, I figured I'd come
here and talk to the judge or something.
Q So this motion is not something that you have
expressed to Mr. Pankauski prior to today, is that correct?

A No. No, I asked him politely to disqualify, you know, under ethical rules.

Q Okay. And, obviously, you felt that request
was rejected, correct?
A Correct. He's here.
Q How do you feel as a result of his continuing
this case in terms of your personal involvement in this
case?

1 A Violated, you know.
Q What is it?
A Violated.
Q Why?
A Because it's a big risk. You know, he was
also referred to me by Joel Weissman, who has very
intimate knowledge of our case and what's going on in
my life, and information regarding my brother. And
I've had conversations with Mr. Weissman about that.
And he was trying to help me out. And I, you know, I
feel violated, that's all I can say.
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. No further questions.
THE COURT: Cross-examination.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Good afternoon, Mr. Bernstein.
A Good afternoon, sir.
Q In addition to contacting my law firm, you
contacted Joel Weissman's law firm?
A Joel Weissman was referred to us.
Q is that a yes?
A Yes.
Q And you contacted Norman Fleisher?
A I might have.

Q You did contact Norman Fleisher?
A Are you telling me I did?
Q I'm asking you.
A No, you were telling me. But I don't know.
Who is Norman Fleisher?
Q And you contacted attorney Amy Beller?
A I might have.
Q And you contacted Brandon Pratt?
MR. FEAMAN: Outside the scope of direct.
THE COURT: Overruled.
THE WITNESS: I retained Brandon Pratt.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Please tell us what other -
A The children retained Brandon Pratt.
Q Your children are minors, correct?
A Yes.
Q Please tell us who the other attorneys in Palm
Beach County are that you contacted regarding this
matter?
A No.
MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, the witness is refusing to answer my question and he hasn't --

THE COURT: I'm sorry.
THE WITNESS: I answered. I said no.
THE COURT: I thought he said none.
```

    THE WITNESS: I said no.
    THE COURT: No, you weren't going to answer
    or no --
    THE WITNESS: No, I don't know to tell him
    who l've contacted in Palm Beach County.
    THE COURT: Okay.
    BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q I'm sorry, let me ask you again because I don't
think we were clear. Besides the attorneys that l've
mentioned, sir, please tell us what other attorneys
you've contacted in Florida regarding this matter.
A I don't know.
MR. FEAMAN: Objection. I think that's
confidential.
THE WITNESS: And it is. I feel it's
confidential too.
THE COURT: I'll overrule that. Good ahead.
So you can answer if you know of others that you
did contact. If not, say so.
THE WITNESS: I think l've contacted others,
I don't know who. I didn't bring a list of who I
contacted and who I haven't.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q You contacted between }6\mathrm{ and }12\mathrm{ attorneys to
represent you in this matter?

```
    A Possibly.
    Q Okay. And you've provided those attorneys that
you've contacted with the information that you provided
to my law firm?
    A Not all of them. Only the ones that
requested information under confidentiality.
    Q And which lawyers --
    A Similar to you.
    Q And which lawyers are those?
    A I can't recall.
    Q Okay. Mr. Feaman asked you whether you were
adverse to your brother Ted, and you said yes?
    A Yes.
    Q How are you adverse to your brother Ted?
    A We have differing interests in the outcomes
out of the estate.
    Q Can you explain what the differing outcomes
are?
    A Yeah. I believe that there's been fraud in
the estate by the estate planners and Ted to change
beneficiaries in the estate. I've asserted those
claims in the courts and in criminal authorities. And
I believe that there's now evidence that certain
documents were signed postmortem for my father and
myself illegally. Ted brought these attorneys in to

1 the estate and has been working closely with them and
to block us from getting proper notices and notices of
his supposed titles and information and accountings and
everything else too. And, you know, so I feel that we
have a differing interest in the outcome of the
estates. And I've expressed that to you and told you
about the documents, and what I thought about him
working with Spallina and Tescher and all of those
things. So that's stuff I don't normally tell somebody
unless they're asking -- and all my documents were
marked confidential that I sent you, all my e-mails
were marked confidential, et cetera.
Q You sent me e-mails?
A Me or my wife.
Q Okay. You don't remember if you sent me
e-mails?
A I don't recall at this moment.
Q In fact, you never --
A I have sent you e-mails. Yes, I have.
Q You sent me, John Pankauski, e-mails?
A Yes, sir.
Q Do you have any of those with you today?
A I believe the ones I just sent you last week,
weren't those e-mails?
Q Okay. Other than February 10th and

Q Okay. Other than February 10th and

A No, I don't mind the badgering.
THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Stop. Eliot, that's not badgering.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.
THE COURT: Okay. So just answer a straight question and this will go smoother.

Go ahead.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Mr. Bernstein -- Mr. Eliot Bernstein -- you
personally, not Candice, you personally never sent an e-mail to my law firm?

A I did.
21 Q Other than February 10th and February 12th?
22 A I don't believe so.
Q Thank you.
Okay. You've read your dad Simon's will?
A Yes, sir.
February 12th, other than those two, did you send me any
e-mails?

A I believe my wife did.
Q Let's get this straight now. Your wife Candice me, personally, John Pankauski, e-mails?

A Sorry, your law firm.
Q Okay. So let's get this straight. And I'm
sorry, but this is important.
```

    Q You are not mentioned in the will as a
    beneficiary?
A Which will?
Q Your dad's will. The one that's before this
court
A Idon't believe so.
Q May I approach the witness with a copy of
Simon's will?
THE COURT: You're allowed to do that.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Would you like to take a look at it. If you
can just look through your dad, Simon's, will, which I
just handed to you, can you just confirm, please, that
you are not a beneficiary under your dad's will?
A I was convinced under this one I wasn't. But
I was told by Spallina and Tescher that I was a
personal property beneficiary or something.
Q So, you know, are you a beneficiary under your
dad's will that I just handed to you?
THE COURT: So the date of the will?
MR. FEAMAN: Objection, asked and answered.
THE COURT: Yeah. Sustained. Date of the
will?
MR. PANKAUSKI: The date of the will is
July 20 -- looks like first -- 2012.

```
THE COURT: Okay. Next question.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q And you are not a beneficiary of your father,
Simon's, revocable trust?
    A I've never seen that. That's been withheld
and suppressed and denied by former counsel --
    THE COURT: So is the answer I don't know?
    THE WITNESS: No, it's l've never seen it.
            THE COURT: Okay. Straight answer, we'll
    move through this.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q Your testimony is you've never seen your dad,
Simon's, revocable trust?
    A That's correct.
    Q Do you have Exhibit \(A\) in front of you that
Mr. Feaman asked you about earlier?
    A No.
    Q And Exhibit A was attached to the verified
motion filed by Mr. Stansbury?
    A No.
    Q Okay. May I approach the witness?
        THE COURT: Yeah.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
    Q I'm going to hand you my verified motion and
I'm going to ask you to direct your attention to Exhibit

1 A. Do you see that that looks like an e-mail from your
wife Candice?
A Yes, sir.
THE COURT: No, that's -- but that's on February 10th. Is that what you're getting at? MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, the date doesn't matter. THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q What is mentioned in line item three?
A Copies of revised wills, trusts for Simon
Bernstein.
Q Thank you.
A That means it's an amended and restated trust
of Simon, not the trust of Simon that you asked about,
just for your edification.
Q And, in fact, his amended trust is your dad's last trust, correct?

A If you believe what they are saying.
Q So you have seen your dad's trust?
A No, l've never seen my dad's trust. I've
seen an amended and restated trust. The original
trust, I believe, has me and my two sisters as
beneficiary, and Ted and his children wholly excluded
with my sister Pam as the only non-beneficiaries in this whole thing.

Q You earlier testified that you sent an e-mail
to me, Pankauski, and my assistant. Do you recall that testimony?

A I believe it was my wife sent an e-mail to your firm.

Q Yes. But l'd like to correct that.
A Okay.
Q Your wife Candice sent an e-mail to my
assistant, not to me?
A Correct.
Q And my assistant followed up with Candice by
e-mail?
A Well, actually, you requested that your
assistant get the documents for your meeting with me.
That's how I recall it. Candice came and asked me, and
we sent you the information to your assistant for your
review for our meeting because you were in California
or something.
Q Let's be clear. I've never spoken to your wife Candice?

A Correct.
Q I have never asked Candice for any documents?
A Except your assistant asked Candice for
documents for our meeting, correct.
Q Correct. You said that you had one
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 97 & & & 99 \\
\hline 1 conversation with me for an hour or so. Do you remember & & & read that, Mr. Bernstein? & \\
\hline 2 that testimony? & & & A Mr. Pankauski -- & \\
\hline 3 A Yeah. And I believe it was two conversations & & & Q No, I'm sorry, I meant just read it to & \\
\hline 4 I had with you total. & & & yourself, so... & \\
\hline 5 Q Now, it's two conversations? & & 5 & A All right. & \\
\hline 6 A Yeah. You called me back to tell me you had & & 6 & MR. PANKAUSKI: I'm sorry, I don't. I & \\
\hline 7 found a way to pay for your bill. & & 7 & should, but I don't. If you'd like to come over & \\
\hline 8 Q And when were those two conversations? & & 8 & here, you're more than welcome to look at it with & \\
\hline 9 A September something. I don't have it in & & 9 & me. & \\
\hline 10 front of me today. I can check my calendar. & & 10 & MR. FEAMAN: May I approach the witness? & \\
\hline 11 Q Do you have your calendar with you? & & 11 & THE COURT: You may. & \\
\hline 12 A Idon't. & & & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 13 Q Okay. And how far apart were those two & & 13 & Q Do you see about -- in your e-mail -- one, two, & \\
\hline 14 conversations? & & & three, four, five, six -- bless you, Mr. Rose -- seven & \\
\hline 15 A Shortly thereafter, I believe. & & & lines up from the bottom? & \\
\hline 16 Q And they were in the evening, right? & & 16 & A Correct. & \\
\hline 17 A l believe. & & 17 & Q You see that as of February 10th, & \\
\hline 18 Q Both of them were? & & & Mr. Bernstein, your story was that I proposed a retainer & \\
\hline 19 A I believe. & & & of \$200,000? & \\
\hline 20 Q And you said the first one lasted an hour or & & 20 & A Correct. & \\
\hline 21 so. Do you recall how long this supposed second & & 21 & Q Okay. So let me go on from there. You were & \\
\hline 22 conversation lasted? & & & asked whether you had -- whether you discussed & \\
\hline 23 A l believe it was rather brief. & & & confidential information to me, and you said yes? & \\
\hline 24 Q Less than five minutes? & & 24 & A Correct. & \\
\hline 25 A Maybe more. & & & Q And you said that it involved forgery and & \\
\hline & 98 & & & 100 \\
\hline 1 Q And I asked you for -- your belief is that I & & & Tescher and Spallina, correct? & \\
\hline 2 asked you for a \$200,000 retainer? & & 2 & A Yes. & \\
\hline 3 A No. My belief -- & & 3 & Q Any other confidential information? & \\
\hline THE COURT: No. No. Wait. Next question. & & 4 & A Yeah, all kinds of stuff. & \\
\hline 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. & & 5 & Q Okay. & \\
\hline 6 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & & 6 & A We talked about in the course of our & \\
\hline \(7 \quad \mathrm{Q}\) Isn't it your belief that -- strike that. & & & conversation about you representing us. & \\
\hline 8 What's your understanding of how much 1 asked for a & & 8 & Q Well, please tell us what that is. & \\
\hline 9 retainer? & & 9 & A You know, I believe we spoke mainly about the & \\
\hline 10 A I don't recall the exact amount for the & & & problems in the estate with the forgeries and the & \\
\hline 11 retainer. & & & notary public, the police investigations that we were & \\
\hline 12 THE COURT: Then stop. That's your answer. & & & launching against Ted, Tescher, et cetera. I believe & \\
\hline 13 Next question. & & & we talked about the various aspects of our legal & \\
\hline 14 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & & & strategy in, you know, against the estates and Ted, et & \\
\hline 15 Q You sent me an e-mail on February 10th? & & & cetera, and were looking to retain you. & \\
\hline 16 A Correct. & & & Q Is your testimony that you and I had a & \\
\hline 17 Q Okay. May I approach the witness. And this is & & & conversation about a legal strategy against the estate? & \\
\hline 18 a copy of the February 10th e-mail that you sent to me, & & & A Against -- yes, against the estates, and the & \\
\hline 19 correct? & & & people in charge, Tescher, Spallina, the personal & \\
\hline 20 A Correct. & & & representatives, getting rid of them, et cetera. & \\
\hline 21 MR. FEAMAN: Do you have another copy of & & & Q And is it your testimony that I discussed trial & \\
\hline 22 that? & & & strategy with you about suing your brother Ted? & \\
\hline 23 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yeah, I should. & & & A Removing the personal representative and Ted & \\
\hline 24 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & & & from having any interest in the estates. & \\
\hline 25 Q And while I'm looking, could you just please & & & Q I had a discussion with you about removing & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}




Q Okay. So you also hired Tripp Scott to
represent you regarding your mom and dad's estate?
A I hired them to represent us, my children and
I. And then I had to split it out to just my children
because of the conflicts.
Q Tripp Scott still does not represent you?
A No, they don't now.
Q Because you can't pay them?
A Partially.
Q And Brandon Pratt doesn't represent you because
you can't pay him?
A No.
MR. FEAMAN: Objection, relevancy.
THE COURT: Yeah, sustained.
THE WITNESS: I actually overpaid him.
THE COURT: Don't do that. Eliot, you know the rules.

THE WITNESS: Sorry, sir,
MR. PANKAUSKI: May I approach the witness,
Your Honor?
THE COURT: May you what?
MR. PANKAUSKI: Approach the witness.
THE COURT: Sure. You don't have to ask me.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q Mr. Bernstein, I'm going to hand you a
composite exhibit, a number of documents -- forgive me,
it's not a composite document. It's one e-mail. And
Mr. Bernstein, you recognize that as an e-mail that you
sent to Ted Bernstein and a number of other people?
THE COURT: Okay. Can lask one thing before
you do. You were talking about a September 24
letter that wasn't introduced into evidence, is
that -- I think that you were short copies of that.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
The September 24, 2013 letter, I'd like to move into evidence.

THE COURT: Any objection.
MR. FEAMAN: No objection.
THE COURT: All right, number 3. I'll give you these things to stamp, here's one, two and -you'll have three.
(Thereupon, Exhibit Number 3 was marked in evidence)

MR. PANKAUSKI: Thank you. May I grab the stamp?

MR. FEAMAN: 1 do.
THE COURT: Let him finish stamping them and then -- so next one will be purportedly number 4 , but we're not there yet.

MR. FEAMAN: I have a relevancy objection to number 4, the batch of documents.

THE COURT: Let's get through the ID part of it first, though.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay.
BY MR. PANKAUSKI
Q So Mr. Bernstein, you recognize that l've
handed you a 74-page e-mail?
A Yes, sir.
Q And that was an e-mail that you prepared?
A I'd have to read it all and check that nothing has been changed. But --

Q Well, I--
A Looks like it could be.
Q I'm sorry?
A I said it looks like it could be, but l'd
have to check. There's been a lot of document
tampering going on, so l'm not going to attest to it a
hundred percent. I haven't had time to review it.
Q Okay. Would you turn to Page 2, please?
A Yes.
Q And I'm directing this question to you about your claim that you shared confidential information with my firm. So please keep that in mind when I ask you these questions. On Page 2 -- excuse me. Go back to

Page 1 for a moment. In this e-mail you not only sent it
to Ted Bernstein, but you sent it to everybody after the
to, T-O, colon, correct?
A is the date missing on that?
MR. FEAMAN: That's my objection; improper, lack of foundation. Wait. Excuse me.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.
THE COURT: Let me see it.
MR. FEAMAN: My objection is lack of predicate, foundation.

THE COURT: I need to see it, so. This is I.D. Number 4. Are you moving this into evidence? Because you need to do that if you're going to refer to it.

MR. PANKAUSKI: Most probably. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. But Mr. Feaman, Eliot Bernstein identified this as his e-mail. He just said he didn't have a chance to look at all the pages to make sure there weren't any documents that were snuck in, in essence.

THE WITNESS: Without the date, I would say it's not my e-mail.

MR. FEAMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Bernstein, if I may.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & 119 \\
\hline 1 & THE WITNESS: Sorry. & give -- the weight I give it, I'm not sure. If & \\
\hline 2 & MR. FEAMAN: Without a date, Your Honor, you & there is an issue about when it was sent. So do & \\
\hline 3 & can't connect confidential - he's offering it for & you remember when you sent this e-mail? & \\
\hline 4 & the purpose that somehow it was -- & THE WITNESS: Looks like maybe shortly after & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: First thing is to identify it. I & December 26 in response to letters from Tescher & \\
\hline 6 & haven't determined more than that right now. So & and Spallina that are attached. & \\
\hline 7 & this is -- it's being shown to Eliot Bernstein, & THE COURT: Of what year? & \\
\hline 8 & purportedly, to be an e-mail from him to others. & THE WITNESS: 2013. & \\
\hline 9 & MR. FEAMAN: Correct. & THE COURT: Okay. All right. So objection & \\
\hline 10 & THE WITNESS: Well, now that it's missing the & overruled. This is Number 4. & \\
\hline 11 & date, I would say it's not my e-mail. & (Thereupon, Exhibit Number 4 was marked in & \\
\hline 12 & THE COURT: Okay. So are you sure you want & evidence) & \\
\hline 13 & me to believe that part of your testimony? Listen & MR. PANKAUSKI: Your Honor, may I get that & \\
\hline 14 & to me carefully. Because if I don't believe it, & copy back and use this one? & \\
\hline 15 & I'm likely not to believe anything else you say. & THE COURT: All right. & \\
\hline 16 & THE WITNESS: Okay. I'll believe it. & MR. PANKAUSKI: I'll stamp it. & \\
\hline 17 & THE COURT: Look at the e-mail. Let's not & THE COURT: Okay. & \\
\hline 18 & play games with me. & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 19 & THE WITNESS: I'm not. & Q Mr. Bernstein, would you be good enough to turn & \\
\hline 20 & THE COURT: Well, that was a game playing -- & to Page 2, please? & \\
\hline 21 & THE WITNESS: Well, I notice right off the & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 22 & bat my normal stamp on my e-mails isn't here. & Q And so you see on Page 2 that in this & \\
\hline 23 & That scared me. Sol said -- & communication to all these people, this e-mail? & \\
\hline 24 & THE COURT: So is I-V-I-E-W-1-T -- & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 25 & THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah. That's all good. & Q You're discussing forgery and fraud? & \\
\hline & & & 120 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: I mean, that's you, right? I & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 2 & mean, if we go ahead and pull your hard drive, & Q And you're discussing wills and trusts of & \\
\hline 3 & will we find this e-mail? & Simon's estate, correct? & \\
\hline 4 & THE WITNESS: No. No. We can go on that & A Well, this is all after our conversation by a & \\
\hline 5 & assumption. & long time, I believe. & \\
\hline 6 & THE COURT: Okay. That's -- okay. All & \(Q\) Is that a yes? & \\
\hline 7 & right. But I don't know the date of it, and you & A Yes. & \\
\hline 8 & can ask questions about that. But the subject is & Q And you're discussing a power of appointment, & \\
\hline 9 & response to Ted and Donald letters, re, emergency & right? & \\
\hline 10 & distributions. And then there's a whole bunch of & A Yes. & \\
\hline 11 & other things there. Okay. And then there's some & Q And you're talking about grandchildren and & \\
\hline 12 & other dates that are in the body of this exhibit. & beneficiaries, correct? & \\
\hline 13 & So Mr. Feaman, your objection is what? & A Correct. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Without an establishment of a & Q And if you turn back to one, you sent this to & \\
\hline 15 & date on the e-mail it has no probative value as to & attorney Mark Manceri? & \\
\hline 16 & whether the communications that Eliot made with & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Pankauski in September were confidential or & Q And you sent it to attorney Caroline Rogers? & \\
\hline 18 & not. & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 19 & THE COURT: Okay. So let me think about & Q Mark Garber? & \\
\hline 20 & that. I'm looking here at the documents and & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 21 & they -- that are contained in this e-mail -- and & Q You sent it to lawyers at Plaster Greenberg? & \\
\hline 22 & there are a bunch of dates there. I see 2012, & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 23 & 2013 dates, court proceedings before me at some & Q In fact, you sent it to, what, a dozen or so & \\
\hline 24 & point in 2013. And so admissibility versus & attorneys? & \\
\hline 25 & weight -- it's admissible. I mean, I may have to & A Yes, sir. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & 123 \\
\hline 1 Q Okay. & & done this before and you're experienced in this. & \\
\hline 2 THE COURT: I need the Exhibit 4 so I can see & & I've warned you -- & \\
\hline 3 it. As well as the other exhibits if you've & 3 & THE WITNESS: I have never done it. & \\
\hline 4 stamped them. & & THE COURT: Listen to the question. Okay. & \\
\hline 5 MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, I think we did. I'll & & You don't understand the question, ask that it be & \\
\hline 6 complete them before we leave. & & repeated. Mr. Feaman is a really good trial & \\
\hline \(7 \quad\) Thank you. & 7 & lawyer. He's not objecting. That means it's a & \\
\hline 8 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & & proper question. And limit your answer to the & \\
\hline 9 Q Mr. Bernstein, just a couple questions about & & question. But when you do a narrative, I block it & \\
\hline 10 your interest in this estate of your father. You & 10 & out. I don' pay attention to anything you're & \\
\hline 11 mentioned that -- I believe you testified that you & 11 & saying. You are not helping your cause. You're & \\
\hline 12 believe you inherit from your dad Simon's estate, is that & 12 & hurting yourself. & \\
\hline 13 accurate. & 13 & THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, it's my first time & \\
\hline 14 A Ido. & 14 & ever being -- & \\
\hline 15 Q Okay. And you don't want to have Ted be the & 15 & THE COURT: So it's your first time wanting & \\
\hline 16 personal representative of the curator because your & 16 & to hurt yourself. & \\
\hline 17 interests are adverse to Ted's? & 17 & THE WITNESS: No, now that you've explained & \\
\hline 18 A And because Ted's been involved in a lot of & 18 & it -- & \\
\hline 19 confidential information, I discussed with you on the & 19 & THE COURT: So your answer is stricken. If & \\
\hline 20 phone. & 20 & the reporter will read back the question, we can & \\
\hline 21 Q The truth is, is that you've asked Ted for & 21 & get a clean answer. And don't give a rambling & \\
\hline 22 money to live on and Ted won't give you that money? & 22 & narrative, please. & \\
\hline 23 A That's your interpretation. & 23 & THE WITNESS: Okay. I apologize. & \\
\hline 24 THE COURT: Listen to the question. Try to & 24 & (Record read) & \\
\hline 25 answer it. & 25 & THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline & & & 124 \\
\hline 1 BYMR. PANKAUSKI & & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 2 Q Yes or no? Is that a yes? & 2 & Q And Ted's refused to? & \\
\hline 3 A I have been forced to ask Ted, yes. & 3 & A No. & \\
\hline 4 Q You've asked Ted to pay your -- the expenses of & & Q Okay. You've asked your brother Ted to pay & \\
\hline 5 your residence? & & your children's tuition? & \\
\hline 6 A What happened was -- & 6 & A l've asked him to pay the expenses of & \\
\hline 7 THE COURT: No. No. Listen. Stop. Stop. & 7 & Bernstein Family Realty and the welfare -- & \\
\hline 8 THE WITNESS: Yeah. & 8 & THE COURT: No. No. See, he didn't ask you & \\
\hline 9 THE COURT: Listen. Your question has to be & 9 & about that. & \\
\hline 10 narrow to the -- your answer has to be narrow to & 10 & MR. FEAMAN: Wait. I have to object to the & \\
\hline 11 the -- & 11 & form. And it doesn't define Ted in what capacity. & \\
\hline 12 THE WITNESS: I was directed to Ted to pay & 12 & THE COURT: I don't know that I need a & \\
\hline 13 those bills. & 13 & capacity for that question. It's a little & \\
\hline 14 BY MR. PANKAUSKI & 14 & different type of question. So the objection is & \\
\hline 15 Q And Ted has refused? & 15 & overruled. But, again, Eliot, listen to the & \\
\hline 16 A Ted has denied that Janet Craig at & 16 & question. Answer it as asked. & \\
\hline 17 Oppenheimer directed that he volunteer to pay the & 17 & Go ahead. Let's read it back. & \\
\hline 18 bills. And I was supposed to deal with Ted only, since & 18 & (Record read) & \\
\hline 19 she had -- he had volunteered to become manager of a & 19 & THE WITNESS: Yes. & \\
\hline 20 company which he didn't have legal rights to and she & 20 & BY MR. PANKAUSKI & \\
\hline 21 didn't have the -- & 21 & Q You are not currently employed? & \\
\hline 22 THE COURT: Stop. Stop. & 22 & A No, I am currently employed. & \\
\hline 23 THE WITNESS: Sorry, Your Honor. & 23 & Q Where are you employed? & \\
\hline 24 THE COURT: Your answer is stricken. So, & 24 & MR. FEAMAN: Relevancy. & \\
\hline 25 Eliot, here's the last -- you know, I mean, you've & 25 & THE COURT: Yeah, tell me the relevancy. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



guess, it's Eliot's wife, Candice, on Thursday,
September 19, 2013. Exhibit 2 is an e-mail to Michelle
from Candice on Friday, September 20, 2013. The
September 20th is an evening e-mail from Candice to
Michelle, 7:10 p.m., I think that's why they're
confused about speaking with me in the evening. I
never spoke with Candice. I only spoke with Eliot once and that was in the afternoon.

Q Do you know which day -- was it the 19th, the 20th or a different day, that you actually spoke with him?

A I don't. I remember where I was. I was -- I was in my office. I was at my desk. I had my headset on. I don't have a headset at home. I spoke with Mr. Bernstein and I remember it because he wanted to sue Don Tescher. And I know Don Tescher's name. I don't really know Mr. Spallina, but I know Don Tescher. And he was talking about a malpractice case and he was talking about a backdated notary. And this was like out of a novel, so I do remember those facts. But the reason for the call was to discuss a malpractice action. And I even referenced that in Exhibit 3; I tell him that there is a two-year statute of limitations for malpractice. He did mention that the malpractice was committed within the estate of his mom
or his dad. We didn't talk about removing Ted as
trustee. What he told me was, he had been calling up
lawyers and he couldn't find anyone to take his case.
And that he had called me -- and what he wanted to know
was, do you have a conflict with Don Tescher? Will you
sue Don Tescher? I said, I don't have a conflict with
7 Don Tescher. I know the gentleman, but he's not a
8 friend. I don't do any business with him. So I was
open to that. Mr. Bernstein later contended that I
asked for a \(\$ 200,000\) retainer. I have never in my life
asked for a \(\$ 200,000\) retainer. I hope to get there one
day, but I'm not there just yet. Our standard
retainer -- and we don't even use the word retainer -it's initial fee, it's \(\$ 15,000\). When Mr. Bernstein -Eliot Bernstein -- to his credit -- told me that he couldn't afford to pay us and he wanted this on some type of a contingency, the conversation got short very fast. Our firm receives literally sometimes dozens of calls a month. And if I listen to everyone's story and read every single document that they want us to read, I would have no time to practice law. So I have a practice, I have a custom, I have a procedure, I do not spend a lot of time on the phone with a prospective client. I give them up to 30 minutes free of charge and that's it. The reason for that is within five to
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8 Bernstein. It didn't last an hour. It didn't last a
half an hour. It lasted less than that. And it was clear that while the facts are interesting, he was not going to hire us. He didn't have the money to hire us. He did not reveal any confidential information to me.
What he did say was that there was a malpractice case,
there was two matters involving mom and dad's estate,
and his focus was Don Tescher.
Q If you look at the letter that you wrote
Mr. Bernstein declining to represent him, what's the date of that?

A September 24, 2013.
Q So Friday, the 20th, was -- is the date on
Exhibit 2. And by the following Tuesday, the 23rd, you Exhibit 2. And by the following Tuesday, the
sent him a letter declining to represent him?
3 A (witness nods head). Yes.
Q Okay. Did --
A Was September 24th a Monday?
ten minutes I can tell whether they're adverse to an existing client, what the legal issue is, and whether I can help them or not. I try to politely then shift the conversation to the sad realities of the business of law, whether you can afford us or not. When they can't afford us, the conversation gets very short. And that's what happened with my conversation with Eliot

\section*{Q Friday the -- if you look --}

A Friday was the 20th, Saturday was the 21st,
Sunday is the 22 nd, Monday is 23 rd. So this went out a
Tuesday, September 24th. So if Candice communicated
with Michelle on September 20th, I probably spoke with
Eliot on Monday or Tuesday because I remember my -- my
immediate reaction to Michelle, who does my intake,
was, there is nothing here to represent. We are not
representing Eliot Bernstein, he can't afford us.
Q Could you just describe generally the nature of your law practice?

A Yeah. We handle estate litigation and
administration. Predominantly restricted to estates,
trusts, guardianships, wills, inheritances. That's all
we do.
Q Are you aware that our law firm does not do
trusts and estate administration work?
A Yes, that's why you called on me. You
originally went to another lawyer, but he was
conflicted out, and that's why you've asked our firm to
assist Ted Bernstein with the administration of trusts and estates.

Q Before you agreed to become the lawyer for Ted
Bernstein in this case, did you undertake, in your view,
a thorough and detailed analysis of your ethical duties



way compromises his position or materially disadvantages
him when you will be representing Ted as the beneficiary
in these matters?
A Absolutely not.
Q Do you anticipate there being some litigation in this trust?

A Yeah, I do, on the trust. Not necessarily
the estate. In the trust. I think that Ted is going
to file a dec action and ask Judge Colin for
instructions on how property under the trust should be
distributed or not distributed.
Q And as counsel, is it your intention to file a
dec action and follow the instructions of the court?
A Absolutely.
MR. ROSE: I have nothing further, Your
Honor.
THE COURT: All right. Mr. Feaman.
MR. FEAMAN: I'll try to be as brief as I
can.
THE COURT: Okay. Thanks. CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. FEAMAN
Q If I understood your testimony, Mr. Pankauski, are you taking the position that there is a difference between documents received by your office that you didn't
see and, therefore, you didn't see those documents? Are you making a distinction?

A Yeah. The only distinction I'm making is in the testimony from Mr. Eliot Bernstein; he said that he sent me documents. He didn't. His wife sent documents to my intake person.

Q All right. And so you are taking the position
that, therefore, you didn't see them?
A No, my position is I didn't read them. There is no therefore. I didn't read those documents that he
sent -- that Candice sent to my intake person.
Q You don't deny your office received them?
A No, not at all.
Q And you are familiar, I would assume, with Rule
of Professional Conduct 4-5.3 (c) which states that
although paralegals or legal assistants may perform the
duties delegated to them by the lawyer without the presence or active involvement of the lawyer, the lawyer
shall review and be responsible for the work product of
paralegals or legal assistants? You would agree with that, correct?

A For existing clients, absolutely. Not for prospective clients. There is no duty on my behalf to review any number of things that come in from dozens of prospects.

Q Now, the -- you actually spoke to this
particular prospective client, correct?
A Yes.
Q And you would agree with me that Mr. Eliot
Bernstein was, in fact, a prospective client, correct?
A Yes.
Q Okay. You said the focus was on Don Tescher.
But could you take a look at Exhibit 3?
A Sure.
Q That's your rejection letter right there?
A Yes.
Q The reference makes no reference to
Mr. Tescher, does it? It says, Estate of Shirley
Bernstein and Estate of Simon Bernstein, correct?
A Yes.
Q Only. And the documents that you received,
which are shown on Exhibit 2, which was the e-mail from
Candice Bernstein to Michelle of your office -- by the
way, how long has she worked for you?
A Oh, Michelle has been with us probably three to four years.

Q Okay. And you received documents that included the Shirley Bernstein trust, the Shirley Bernstein will, back to 2008, correct?

A Michelle from my law office received those

1 documents on Exhibit 2.
Q Okay. And the Simon Bernstein Amended Trust of
2012, correct?
A Yes.
Q Have you now seen the Simon Bernstein original
trust? Before it was allegedly amended in 2012?
A The 2008?
Q I don't know.
A Yeah, when you say original, I don't know
what you mean by that.
Q Okay.
A I looked at Mr --
Q The trust which this amendment purportedly
amends?
A I don't know if l've looked at it. I've
looked at Simon Bernstein's trust that Mr. Rose gave
me, I believe it's the 2012 document.
Q Now, you said you were familiar with the estate
plan. And all of the documents that are listed here
would be necessary documents that would make you familiar
with the estate plan, correct?
A Necessary, no. I believe the 2012 trust
amendment revokes all prior amendments, which would
make prior ones a non-issue.
Q There is also documents here that have no
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 157 & & & 159 \\
\hline 1. relationship to the -- as far as you can tell -- the & 1 & Bernstein. & \\
\hline 2 estate plan, like the Bernstein Holdings, LLC? & 2 & Q So even though you didn't learn about it then, & \\
\hline 3 A I don't think that's accurate. It's my & 3 & they still sent to you the Bernstein Holdings, LLC for a & \\
\hline 4 understanding from Ted Bernstein and Mr. Rose that & 4 & reason I guess you have no idea, is that right? & \\
\hline 5 Bernstein Holdings, LLC was an entity that Simon & 5 & A Yeah. I don't know why Eliot's wife, & \\
\hline 6 created to own a house that Eliot lives in. So where & 6 & Candice, sent Michelle Bernstein Holdings, LLC other & \\
\hline 7 Eliot lives, that's actually owned by an LLC created by & 7 & than she wanted someone to review them. & \\
\hline 8 his dad, Simon. And the members of the LLC are three & 8 & Q That's certainly -- I'm sorry, I don't mean to & \\
\hline 9 trusts. Sol think that's all part of Simon's estate & & interrupt -- & \\
\hline 10 plan, you know, that's one way he helped out Eliot. & 10 & A That's all right, you're doing a great job. & \\
\hline 11 Q By your cross-examination of Mr. Eliot & 11 & You know, when prospective probate clients call you, & \\
\hline 12 Bernstein, when you asked about whether he had asked Ted & & they won't do a document dump. They want to open up, & \\
\hline 13 Bernstein for money, that would be money that would be & & they want to talk to you for hours, and they want you & \\
\hline 14 due either Eliot Bernstein's children or Eliot Bernstein & & to read everything in the world. We don't do that. We & \\
\hline 15 through those trusts, correct? & & don't have the time or the patience to do it. & \\
\hline 16 A I don't know if they're due through that & 16 & Q You would agree with me that the Bernstein & \\
\hline 17 trust. It's my understanding the residence that Eliot & & Holdings, LLC certainly has nothing to do with the & \\
\hline 18 lives in is owned in the LLC, which is responsible for & & malpractice action against Don Tescher, isn't that & \\
\hline 19 paying the real estate taxes, the maintenance and & & correct? & \\
\hline 20 everything like that. I think Eliot Bernstein asked & 20 & A I wouldn't say absolutely, no. I'm not & \\
\hline 21 the trustees of those trusts for money and they've run & & trying to be evasive. I don't think that's an element & \\
\hline 22 out of money, so he asked Ted for more money. & & of the purported malpractice by Tescher and Spallina. & \\
\hline 23 Q And the LLC is, in fact, the Bernstein & 23 & Q Okay. Thanks. & \\
\hline 24 Holdings, LLC? & 24 & A Sure. & \\
\hline 25 A Yes. & 25 & THE COURT: All right. & \\
\hline 158 & & & 160 \\
\hline 1 Q Correct? & 1 & MR. FEAMAN: Okay. & \\
\hline 2 A Yes. & 2 & MR. ROSE: Two questions? & \\
\hline 3 Q Okay. And you received those documents back in & 3 & THE COURT: Yes, that's it. & \\
\hline 4 September, correct? & 4 & RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION & \\
\hline 5 A Michelle did, yes. & 5 & BY MR. ROSE & \\
\hline \(6 \quad \mathrm{Q}\) Okay. And you are aware that there is a & 6 & Q Bernstein Family Realty is not a beneficiary of & \\
\hline 7 dispute over payments from the LLC from Mr. Ted Bernstein & 7 & the estate, the will, the trust, is that correct? & \\
\hline 8 to Mr. Eliot Bernstein, correct? You asked about it on & 8 & A That's correct. & \\
\hline 9 cross-examination? & 9 & Q Absolutely nothing to do with what proceedings & \\
\hline 10 A There is a dispute over payments to the LLC. & 10 & are going to be before Judge Colin, as far as you know? & \\
\hline 11 Q Payments from the LLC to either Mr. Eliot & 11 & A Absolutely correct. & \\
\hline 12 Bernstein or his kids or for the support of the house? & 12 & MR. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 13 A You're confusing the LLC with the trust. & 13 & THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat. & \\
\hline 14 Q Okay. So the trust should be making payments & 14 & THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 15 to the Bernstein Holdings, LLC, is that your & 15 & THE COURT: Any other witnesses on your end? & \\
\hline 16 understanding? & 16 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No, Your Honor. & \\
\hline 17 A No. Eliot wants money from Ted individually & 17 & THE COURT: Okay. I have just a question. & \\
\hline 18 and Ted as trustee of either Shirley or Simon's trust. & 18 & In the estate case, where you're representing Ted, & \\
\hline 19 And Shirley and Simon's trust don't permit & 19 & that's the one where Mr. Feaman you're & \\
\hline 20 distributions to Eliot. & 20 & representing the creditor, correct? & \\
\hline 21 Q You first found out about the issue -- that & 21 & MR. FEAMAN: Yes. & \\
\hline 22 dispute between Mr. Eliot Bernstein and Mr. Ted Bernstein & 22 & THE COURT: Eliot is representing himself. & \\
\hline 23 about the money when you spoke to him in September of & 23 & Okay. I'll let you do this, Mr. Feaman. What's & \\
\hline 24 2013, didn't you? & 24 & pending in that case now, anything? Other than & \\
\hline 25 A No, l learned about it from Alan Rose and Ted & 25 & the motion to appoint a curator. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 161 & & & 163 \\
\hline 1 & MR. FEAMAN: In the estate itself? & 1 & appointed as personal representative. & \\
\hline 2 & THE COURT: Yeah. & 2 & THE COURT: Well, hear what I'm going to do, & \\
\hline 3 & MR. FEAMAN: I am only aware of the motion to & 3 & and then you'll see if you want to do that. & \\
\hline 4 & appoint Ted Bernstein as the -- & 4 & MR. GLASKO: Yes, sir. & \\
\hline 5 & THE COURT: PR. & 5 & THE COURT: Okay. Motion to disqualify is & \\
\hline 6 & MR. FEAMAN: -- personal representative. & 6 & denied. & \\
\hline 7 & THE COURT: Okay. & 7 & The burden is on Eliot. And I'm treating & \\
\hline 8 & MR. FEAMAN: But I have not reviewed the & 8 & this as really being Eliot's motion to show & \\
\hline 9 & file. & 9 & that he's an interested person under 731.20. & \\
\hline 10 & THE COURT: All right. And so is there an & 10 & He has not carried that burden. And so that & \\
\hline 11 & action filed with respect to Simon Bernstein's & 11 & would disqualify him from being someone who has & \\
\hline 12 & trust? & 12 & an interest in trying to stop Mr. Pankauski & \\
\hline 13 & MR. PANKAUSKI: No -- l'm sorry. & 13 & from representing Ted. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. FEAMAN: Not yet. & 14 & And, you know, I agree with the law that & \\
\hline 15 & THE COURT: All right. Okay. Have a seat. & 15 & counsel -- Mr. Feaman just cited. This is & \\
\hline 16 & Can I see the motion that -- & 16 & really a view of Eliot from a subjective point & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Pankauski -- that you filed on behalf of & 17 & of view as to -- as a prospective client of & \\
\hline 18 & Ted to be appointed PR and the motion that asks & 18 & Mr. Pankauski, now that Mr. Pankauski is & \\
\hline 19 & for -- and I think it was both counsel, & 19 & venturing to represent Ted, which is a & \\
\hline 20 & including Mr. Glasko -- for a curator instead. & 20 & subsequent representation. Mr. Pankauski is & \\
\hline 21 & MR. PANKAUSKI: Yes, Your Honor. & 21 & barred from representing Ted if there are & \\
\hline 22 & THE COURT: Let me see those physically. & 22 & interests that -- in the estate -- that & \\
\hline 23 & MR. PANKAUSKI: This is my motion for & 23 & materially -- that are materially adverse to & \\
\hline 24 & appointment. And I can get you the response in & & those of Eliot, and the rest of the rule. I & \\
\hline 25 & opposition. & 25 & find that Eliot has not carried his burden of & \\
\hline & 162 & & & 164 \\
\hline 1 & THE COURT: Okay. I remember seeing the & 1 & proof on that, even from a light most favorable & \\
\hline 2 & response, but -- okay. So here's -- everyone & 2 & to him, which l'm giving him. & \\
\hline 3 & finished, ready for me to rule? I'm ready to rule & 3 & So motion to disqualify denied. & \\
\hline 4 & on everything. & 4 & Ted's motion for appointment of himself as & \\
\hline 5 & MR. FEAMAN: The only thing I would add, Your & 5 & curator or administrator ad litem, denied. & \\
\hline 6 & Honor, would be the case that we faxed to you & 6 & William Stansbury and -- your client is & \\
\hline 7 & earlier today, and to everybody else, Metcalf v. & 7 & who? & \\
\hline 8 & Metcalf, 785 So. 2d. 747, which states, quote, in & 8 & MR. GLASKO: Excuse me, my client is Lisa and & \\
\hline 9 & considering whether the attorney-client privilege & 9 & Jill. & \\
\hline 10 & applies to disqualify an attorney from opposing a & 10 & THE COURT: Okay. Are they -- are they a & \\
\hline 11 & former client, the focus is on the perspective of & 11 & moving party in a formal sense? & \\
\hline 12 & the person seeking out the lawyer, not on what the & 12 & MR. GLASKO: They are the children of the & \\
\hline 13 & lawyer does after the consultation. & 13 & decedent, Judge. & \\
\hline 14 & THE COURT: Okay. I agree that's the law. & 14 & THE COURT: But have they filed -- I don't & \\
\hline 15 & All right. So - yes. & 15 & have all the paperwork, I want to make sure I & \\
\hline 16 & MR. GLASKO: Judge, are you making a ruling & 16 & do -- have they filed requesting a -- that there & \\
\hline 17 & on the appointment of curator today? & 17 & be a curator other than Ted. & \\
\hline 18 & THE COURT: I am. I'm doing it in like about & 18 & MR. GLASKO: No, sir, l've only made an ore & \\
\hline 19 & a minute or two. & 19 & tenus motion. & \\
\hline 20 & MR. GLASKO: I would like to ask the court -- & 20 & THE COURT: The ore tenus motion is denied & \\
\hline 21 & because we wanted to lodge an ore tenus objection & 21 & only - not on the merit because I'm not doing & \\
\hline 22 & to that. And I think the court needs -- & 22 & this -- but I don't have to because William is an & \\
\hline 23 & THE COURT: Why? & 23 & interested person, able to, as a secured creditor, & \\
\hline 24 & MR. GLASKO: -- the court needs to hear some & 24 & . who does have an interest under the case law and & \\
\hline 25 & information with regard to Ted's ability to be & 25 & under the statute in having this estate, which is & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
close the court -- but I'm going to stay here and let the lawyers and Eliot come back in to tell me what you've agreed to. \\
Okay. Thanks. \\
(Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 5:03 p.m.)
\end{tabular} &  \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
CERTIFICATE \\
THE STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF PALM BEACH. \\
1, DAVID L. MARSAA, Professional Reporter, \\
State of Florida at large, certify that I was \\
authorized to and did stenographically report the \\
foregoing proceedings and that the transcript is a \\
true and complete record of my stenographic notes. \\
Dated this 5th day of July, 2014.
\end{tabular} &  \\
\hline
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\title{
IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA CASE NO: \(502012 C P 004391 X X X X S B\)
}

IN RE: THE ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE
HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN

DATE: MAY 23, 2014

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.

\section*{1 APPEARANCES :}

2

3 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM STANSBURY:

4 MR. PETER M. FEAMAN, ESQ.
MR. JEFFREY T. ROYER, ESQ.
5 PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
3695 W. Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9
6 Boynton Beach, FL 33436

7

8 APPEARING OF BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN:

9 MR. ALAN ROSE, ESQ.
PAGE MRACHEK
10505 S. Flagler Drive
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
11

12 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF FOUR ADULT GRANDCHILDREN:

13 JOHN P. MORRISSEY, ESQ.
JOHN P. MORRISSEY, P.A.
14330 Clematis Street, Suite 213
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
15

16 APPEARING AS THE CURATOR:

17 BENJAMIN BROWN, ESQ.
MATWICZYK \& BROWN, LLP
18625 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 401
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
19

20 APPEARING PRO SE:

21 ELIOT BERNSTEIN

22

23

24

25

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable MARTIN COLIN at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, state of Florida, on Friday, the 23rd day of May, 2014, to wit:

THE COURT: Good morning. Let me get my computer on. We're here in the Bernstein case. Appearances.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Eliot Bernstein, pro se.

MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. And from my office, Jeff Royer .

MR. MORRISSEY: John Morrissey on behalf of four of the adult grandchildren.

MR. ROSE: Alan Rose on behalf of Ted Bernstein.

MR. BROWN: Ben Brown as curator of the estate.

THE COURT: All right. What do we have for today?

MR. ROSE: Before we get to that, I have
one -- sort of an important issue that came up last night.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. ROSE: It will take 30 seconds.

Ted Bernstein sent me an email. And he replied to an email, and accidently the email went to Eliot Bernstein. It was attorney-client privileged communication directly to me from my client Ted Bernstein. The email went to Eliot Bernstein. Under Rule 1.285 I sent to Mr. Eliot Bernstein an email immediately asking him to delete or return the privileged materials.

I discussed the issue with Mr. Eliot Bernstein this morning and he advised me that he has emailed the document to 2,000 people.

He's had a history of posting things on the internet. Because it's attorney-client privileged information it's very sensitive and I'd request the Court to instruct him to comply with Rule 1.285. It was a reply to an email that had a bunch of names and accidentally it went to him. Mr. Bernstein advised me immediately and I advised Eliot immediately. THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, did you get an
email from counsel?
MR. BERNSTEIN: I did not get his email.
I got an email from my brother addressed to me only. I read it, as usual when I get something bizarre that's attacking and threatening me, or whatever. It was from Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein.

THE COURT: It was from --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Ted Bernstein to Eliot Bernstein.

THE COURT: Not from the lawyer?
MR. BERNSTEIN: No. He misrepresents
everything.
THE COURT: We'll take it up at the end. There's other things scheduled. If you remember, we'll take it up.

MR. ROSE: Fine.
THE COURT: Go ahead.
MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court.
Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William Stansbury, interested person in the estate.

This is Mr. Stansbury's petition for the appointment of an administrator ad litem which has been submitted to Your Honor together with a supplement to the petition to the requested
relief.
We're asking this Court to appoint Mr. Stansbury as an administrator ad litem of the estate for the sole purpose of making an appearance on behalf of the estate in some litigation that is currently pending in Illinois involving a life insurance policy on Simon Bernstein's life, the deceased, with a death benefit of \(\$ 1.7\) million.

That litigation has been pending for over a year from what I can tell, or about a year. And it has not involved the estate which is very interesting because the documents that I've recently obtained since the filing of our motion, Your Honor, we found out that insurance policy, according to internal records of the insurance company, is actually owned by the deceased Simon Bernstein. So arguably not only is it an asset of the estate, that insurance policy, and the proceeds therefrom, but any litigation concerning the distribution of those proceeds should be in this court, Your Honor.

Now that's jumping ahead. But the point is that we're dealing with an asset of the estate and, therefore, this court has every
interest in seeing that the estate's assets are marshaled. The first step for that, Your Honor, would be to appoint an administrator ad litem to at least intervene in that federal court action that's up in Illinois.

The former personal representatives of this estate, Your Honor, were doing everything they could to keep the money out of the estate from that life insurance policy. They have alleged that the beneficiary is the life insurance trust. The problem is nobody can find the original life insurance trust. Nobody can find even a copy of the life insurance trust. And the records that we show show that the beneficiaries are not, in fact, a life insurance trust. But the first beneficiary, according to Heritage, which is the insurance company, is LaSalle National Trust. The second beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Trust, whatever that is. But it's not the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust that is being alleged up in Illinois.

Now if there's no clear beneficiary, as Your Honor is aware, then the life insurance proceeds would go to the estate and become an
asset, or liquid assets for the estate. Now that money presently has been put into the registry of the court up in Illinois by the insurance company. They were first requested by the personal representatives of this estate, the former, to pay it to others. And the insurance company said we don't have any documentation to justify that. So they just impleaded the funds. The litigation has been pending, and despite the fact that the estate is the owner of the policy, the estate has never been represented in that action. Now the estate has a high probability of success, we believe, in this case. Because if they're going to try to establish a lost instrument without the original or without a copy it's going to be based, I assume, on oral testimony from people. And that is a high burden. Interestingly we found out at first, on this so-called insurance trust, Mr. Spallina (phonetic), who was the personal representative, formerly, of this estate, represented to the insurance company that he was the trustee of this insurance trust. When that didn't work, Your Honor - we
have a document that we'll show to the court up in Chicago -- when that didn't work they're now in court up there saying that Mr . Ted Bernstein is the trustee, or successor trustee, of that insurance trust. Yet there is no copy of that trust before the court in any fashion. The plaintiffs in that lawsuit are now not only the insurance trust, the so-called insurance trust, it's now all the adult children of Mr. Simon Bernstein. Interestingly enough, Your Honor the adult children are not beneficiaries of this estate, Your Honor. It's the ten grandchildren who are the residual beneficiaries as a result of the pour-over provision of the will that leaves all the liquid assets in a trust. The beneficiaries of that trust are the ten grandchildren. So the adults, the adult children of Mr . Simon Bernstein, have every incentive, Your Honor, to see that the estate is not inherited with these life insurance proceeds because if they succeed in this action in Illinois then the adult children inherit or receive the proceeds of the life insurance not the ten grandchildren over whom you have jurisdiction as the beneficiaries
in this estate.
The curator, Your Honor, has no objection. Mr. Brown --

THE COURT: Let me stop and hear from Mr. Brown. What's your position on their motion? MR. BROWN: I'm not taking a position on the motion, Your Honor. I can get into it further, I don't really want to interrupt Mr. Feaman. But it would seem to me that if the main estate creditor wants to try to intervene in Chicago on behalf of the estate to bring assets into the estate without looking to the estate for current payment of his fees, in other words, if he finally succeeds then he can then come back to this Court and ask to have his fees reimbursed, then that would seem to be a benefit to the estate as far as marshaling the assets of the estate and, of course, the curator and/or personal representative has a duty to the creditors also to try to marshal the assets of the estate.

THE COURT: I got your position.
Mr. Rose?
MR. ROSE: Our position is pretty simple.
And I -- this is an evidentiary hearing --

THE COURT: It's an opening to tell me what's going on. \(I\) just want your position.

MR. ROSE: Tetra (phonetic) and Spallina, who were the prior PRs, believe that the claim to the insurance policy by the estate had no merit because of their discussions with their client, because of their investigation of facts. These people have no evidence to support -- they have no parol evidence. This is a fight over an insurance policy that only beneficiary -- there's no dispute that the beneficiary the insurance company has on record, there was a prior beneficiary which was a company pension plan that the company is dissolved, and that's out -- the only contingent beneficiary, and there's an affidavit that's been filed attached to one of their motions in this Court where the insurance company says the only other beneficiary ever named was the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Life Insurance Trust. There's a shorthand in a computer system, where somebody shorthanded it in the computer, and the affidavit in the insurance company addressing that which says that's shorthand, but in our forms the only
beneficiary ever listed is this irrevocable life insurance trust, their only piece of evidence supporting their claim is that the insurance trust cannot be found. But the trust did exist. It has a tax \(I D\) number from -- a federal tax ID number. There's numerous references to it between different lawyers and nobody can find the trust document now. That's an issue that's going to be resolved in Illinois. But they have no evidence -- other than the fact that the trust doesn't exist -they don't have any parol evidence. They don't have any documents. They don't have anything on behalf of the estate.

Our concern is they're going to spend the precious few estate assets that are remaining to go to Illinois and fight an issue that has no merit, can subject the estate to a claim, you know, for fees or indemnification or prevailing party attorney's fees award.

The policy was owned by Simon Bernstein. That means it's included in his taxable estate. But it does not mean it's owned in his probate estate. The beneficiary is the beneficiary. The policy proceeds are in Illinois. They've
been deposited into the court --
THE COURT: What's the issue that the Illinois judge is being asked to decide?

MR. ROSE: Being asked to decide, among competing claims, to the proceeds of this race. Eliot Bernstein is there asserting the exact position that Mr. Stansbury wants to go there to assert. Eliot is asserting that the money should go to the estate and not the irrevocable life insurance trust. That issue is going to require, you know, a summary judgment or a trial with parol evidence to determine who the beneficiary is of that policy.

Mr. Stansbury has gone there to intervene and was denied by the judge the right to intervene in the case already once.

Our main concern really is twofold. The expense on both -- what's actively being spent. We want to make sure no estate funds are being expended to pursue this. In an estate that has a very limited amount of funds here --

THE COURT: Mr. Feaman says that his client will not seek fees for his role as administrator ad litem unless and until a recovery might take place and then he'll make
an application with funds then available, meaning the \(\$ 1.7\) million would then apparently come into the estate.

MR. ROSE: I haven't heard testimony to that effect yet.

THE COURT: That's a representation.
MR. ROSE: He'd also need to represent that he would indemnify and hold the estate harmless if there's any adverse action as a result of him intervening in that case and losing either an award of attorneys fees or -THE COURT: I'm not sure about that part yet. I got your position.

MR. ROSE: And then the final point is Mr. Stansbury is a potential creditor of the estate. To the extent he goes and -- even if he would win that lawsuit and bring money into the estate \(I\) don't think it's fair to let him get a -- I don't know what his fee arrangement would be.

THE COURT: I'd hear that. Under the statute he has to prove that he provided a benefit to the estate.

MR. ROSE: We don't even know if his claim will still exist --

THE COURT: It may or may not.
Mr. Morrissey?
MR. MORRISSEY: To address first the last point why should Mr. Stansbury not be allowed to act even though his fees may or may not come at the end. Well, he's a claimant. He's not a creditor. There's a distinction here. As a claimant he might not be privy, or should not be privy, to certain information because he doesn't have a judgment. He's not one of the eight classes of people. If he's allowed to intervene as a claimant in the Illinois action he may, in fact, become privy to certain information that we, or the estate, does not want him to become privy to because we may end up having to negotiate with a claimant to satisfy a claim. We don't want him privy to certain information. We don't want him intervening in actions, and certainly in actions that he's already sought intervention and been denied.

THE COURT: Was he denied because he didn't have standing because he hadn't been appointed as an administrator? Is that the reason why he was denied?

MR. MORRISSEY: He attempted to intervene individually and was denied. He was denied because -- I've attached the order. I filed an opposition and attached the order. And I can read from a couple of sections of the order to indicate and let Your Honor know why he was denied.

THE COURT: Hold on. I see it here.
MR. MORRISSEY: The court there went through an extensive analysis, legal standard and analysis in its order speaking of intervention as a right, and permissive intervention. And the court said, "The fact that you might anticipate a benefit from a judgment in favor of one of the parties to a lawsuit, maybe, for example, you're a creditor of one of them, does not entitle you to intervene in their lawsuit." That is really the position that \(M r\). Stansbury is in. The court went on, "Here stansbury's claimed interest is merely an economic interest that is too remote for purposes of the rule because the estate is not a party to this lawsuit. And Stansbury does not assert that he or the estate are beneficiaries to the life insurance
proceeds nor the Bernstein Trust."

THE COURT: You represent, Mr. Morrissey, who?

MR. MORRISSEY: I represent the four grandchildren.

THE COURT: Who, according to Mr. Feaman, may benefit if this money comes to the estate? MR. MORRISSEY: Correct. THE COURT: So the way the case is being litigated now -- is the only plaintiff the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust vs. the life insurance company? MR. MORRISSEY: Well -THE COURT: That's the way the style of the case is. Are there more plaintiffs than that?

MR. FEAMAN: They amended subsequently and joined the adult -- four of the five of the adult children were joined as plaintiffs.

THE COURT: And who is representing them?
MR. FEAMAN: Somebody up in Chicago in
that action.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: I think technically the lawsuit was started by the trust against the insurance
company. The insurance company filed an interpleaded, probably by counterclaim. My understanding is, subject to someone correcting me, the insurance company was granted interpleader. They put the funds in the registry of the court. The insurance company is out of the case and even though you have the original style what's left is people asserting a claim to the proceeds. Eliot is there, I think, advocating the claim on behalf of the estate --

THE COURT: Eliot is pro se. I want -- we recognize that. From Mr. Morrissey's point of view, do you take a position that your clients, the grandchildren, may have an interest in these monies?

MR. MORRISSEY: No -- well, our position is the following -THE COURT: That question first. MR. MORRISSEY: Our position -- no, on behalf of the four grandchildren. THE COURT: You waive any -- on behalf of those children you waive any claim to that money? MR. MORRISSEY: I'm not going to waive on
the record.
THE COURT: You have to stand on one side of the fence or the other on that.

MR. MORRISSEY: Quite honestly, I haven't asked them that question. I can't waive something on behalf of my clients when I haven't asked them that question point blank.

THE COURT: All right. So you have -- who
-- the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust is represented by Chicago --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Adam Simon who is the brother to David Simon who is married to my sister Pam Simon who stands to benefit if the money goes through Illinois.

THE COURT: Illinois counsel, okay. And the four children are represented by one lawyer?

MR. FEAMAN: That's Adam Simon.
THE COURT: Because of the impleading of the funds the battle right now is between the trust and these four children because those are the parties that are now competing for the money?

MR. ROSE: I don't think -- I don't know
if the four children are technically parties.

I think they're just -- the battle I think is between Eliot who is asserting that these funds should come into this estate --

THE COURT: Eliot was allowed to
intervene?
MR. BERNSTEIN: I got sued in the case, Your Honor, because they had gone behind my back to try to steal this policy -- around you too -- and they were told by the insurance company, when Robert Spallina submitted what I allege is a fraudulent insurance claim, and they were told by the insurance company that the claim was denied and they needed a probate court order from you to approve the beneficiary scheme they were proposing using some mashugana lost trust --

THE COURT: Eliot, you're named as a cross-plaintiff, so you are --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Now I've somehow become a plaintiff -- a defendant that you showed me last week, or two weeks ago, when you handed me that order. I haven't quite figured out how I'm the named defendant.

Your Honor, I'm representing their -- my children's interests.

THE COURT: Hold it. I'm reading something. I see a entity in the style of the case up there called the Simon Bernstein Trust, N.A. What's that? Is that something different than the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust? MR. ROSE: It's in the affidavit that was filed, I think attached to Mr. Brown's recent petition for instructions, but... In the insurance company's computer they shorthanded the name of the trust. The beneficiary is the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Life Insurance Trust which is the --

THE COURT: Ted Bernstein is an individual in this suit now. And who is representing him? MR. ROSE: I don't know that he is an individual. If he's an individual he's represented by Adam Simon.

THE COURT: I'm reading it. That's where
I get it. They're individually and/or as purported trustee of the irrevocable trust. Eliot is a cross-plaintiff -- that's where you're named, Eliot -- vs. Ted, individually and as trustee of the irrevocable trust. And then a bunch of other people and entities are cross-defendants. Right now the competing
parties in Illinois are the irrevocable trust and Eliot. Is that basically it --

MR. ROSE: Yes.
THE COURT: -- who are active; is that true?

So the question is should the claimant be declared here an administrator ad litem for the purposes of being permitted to ask the court to be able to intervene, which the court may or may not do?

MR. ROSE: There's one other part of my opening I missed on my notes --

THE COURT: Go ahead. Sure.
MR. ROSE: Mr. Morrissey touched on it and reminded me. If you're going to appoint an administrator ad litem it should not be Mr. Stansbury. You can appoint somebody and Mr. Stansbury could fund it, he could pay the expenses of, let's say, Mr. Brown or an independent person to hire a Chicago lawyer and, you know, advance the case. But you would then be preserving issues of privilege and you would be preserving the integrity of the system rather than have Mr. Stansbury, who is a claimant, who is adverse on multiple levels to
the estate, as the active person he would be funding the litigation and, in my view, he should be required to indemnify. But you'd have a neutral third person doing it rather that Mr. Stansbury which I think makes a lot more sense.

THE COURT: What do you say about the latter comment? That's the only one \(I\) want you to address.

MR. FEAMAN: The fact that Mr. Stansbury will become privy to confidential information

THE COURT: Well, we're not at --
MR. FEAMAN: Ben Brown --
THE COURT: -- I'll allow someone else to
intervene to appropriately determine whether the estate has an interest in this money or not. That's the issue, correct?

MR. FEAMAN: Yes.
THE COURT: All right. Right now the person technically doing that is Eliot who tries his best as a pro se. But it's pretty tough --

MR. FEAMAN: That's right. He doesn't represent the estate.

THE COURT: He represents himself individually. So someone who may look for the interest of the estate. And, you know, these type of litigation, obviously, the Illinois judge is going to have to take evidence -- I'm not going to do that in my hearing -- on who the beneficiary is of this policy. That's what has to be determined.

MR. FEAMAN: That's correct. THE COURT: The issue is narrow and I think everyone agrees with that.

MR. FEAMAN: And --
THE COURT: What I'm thinking about is you kind of want to be able to make sure that everyone who, perhaps, could ultimately be a beneficiary of this policy have a voice in that litigation. That's the due process part of it. So my thought is, having heard everybody say what they said, \(I\) rarely find it to be a problem allowing someone to intervene -- unless they're a stranger, this wouldn't be a stranger -- because a voice is a good thing to have. We allow interventions all the time here on my cases. I just hear from someone else. They don't win or lose unless there's merit to
them. Someone right now is hovering the position that the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Trust is the beneficiary. They're lawyered up. The only other person that seems to suggest that that may not be the case and it is the estate that's the beneficiary is Eliot. So I'm considering having someone other than Eliot -or in addition to Eliot, because he's there individually on behalf of himself and he's not representing the estate -- someone represent the interest of the estate. And so the proposal is that that be someone funded by your client, Mr. Feaman, but not -- but someone who is more neutral like Mr. Brown or something like that. What do you say about that?

MR. FEAMAN: We came up with Mr. Stansbury because if he's the one that's willing to fund the intervention and to fund the person -- the lawyer -- to make sure that the estate is going to be protected --

THE COURT: He has more -- he's like Eliot. He has his own interests, personal interest. MR. FEAMAN: He does. He has interests in
money coming into the estate, absolutely.
THE COURT: But someone who is more neutral may be the right move there. If that's where I'm going on this, what is your position on that?

MR. FEAMAN: If that's where you're going on that then Ben Brown is acceptable in that regard. I would just -- since Mr. Stansbury is the one that's volunteering, if you will, to fund initially the cost of this, then he needs, through me, some input with Mr. Brown.

THE COURT: Sure.
MR. FEAMAN: On all matters.
THE COURT: You'd be allowed to have input with him. But Mr. Brown would be there, assuming he's willing to take the assignment, to preserve issues of confidentiality and other concerns that could exist. He sounded, all along, from the beginning, as the perfect centerpiece to do this. What do you say?

MR. BROWN: Actually, I -- a few things to say, Your Honor. The first thing is with regard to the privilege issue. I'm not aware of any privilege that would apply.

THE COURT: And I'm not either. But let's
get past that point.
MR. BROWN: The testamentary exception, this is squarely in the testamentary exception, so there is no privilege in my view of this.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BROWN: The second issue is that I promised David Simon, I've given to you before, this email thread where he sent me an email and said you're trying to have Mr . Stansbury appointed as administrator ad litem, the estate should not be appearing in Illinois, you're going to be wasting estate assets and you have a conflict of interest because you're the curator and the estate pours over into the revocable trust and the beneficiaries of the revocable trust don't want this policy to go to the estate. I've been accused of conflict of interest. I've been accused of beaches of fiduciary duty already by David Simon who, apparently, is Adam Simon's brother and the father of some of the grandchildren.

My third issue is that, I think it's from the Vietnam War, this comes within the category of mission creek. I'm supposed to be temporary interim limited curator. There's supposed to
be a personal representative appointed at some point. I've been asked by the parties to consider being the personal representative. Frankly, Your Honor, this case is -- goes off in a lot of different directions. Whoever the personal representative is going to spend a lot of money just dealing with the different parties and the different people who are involved. And, frankly, I don't know that I have the time. And I really don't want to be the personal representative. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BROWN: If I'm appointed administrator ad litem it seems like I'm in there for the long run on a federal case. They do move them pretty quickly here in the Southern District of Florida. I know that from experience. I don't know about the Northern District of Illinois. MR. FEAMAN: Well, there's been -- I can answer that question.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. FEAMAN: There's been a notification of a docket entry entered by the judge on -- it said that all case dispositive motions are to be filed by mid-July, July 13. So it sounds
like we're on a rocket docket to me, Your Honor .

And on behalf of Mr. Stansbury I would like to, since he is running the cost, be able to work with whomever it is to pick counsel up in Chicago. And that - and to review counsel's bills from Chicago and to help strategize with that counsel the best way to proceed up there should Your Honor go that direction.

THE COURT: All right. So let me ask this question: Is there also before me a petition to appoint or determine a PR?

MR. FEAMAN: Not today.
THE COURT: Not today, okay.
MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I don't know if that's set for hearing at all. Although I request that it be set for hearing. The other issue with a \(P R\) versus a curator is that Mr. Stansbury has active litigation going on in front of Judge Blanc right now. So far there hasn't been any conflict as far as Ted Bernstein and the estate defending against Mr. Stansbury's claim, but there have been multiple instances where people in this case,
in this room, basically, have said that there could eventually be a conflict of interest because there could be some finger pointing in cross claims.

THE COURT: It's hard to purify a case like this and not have it -- not have a situation where it's allegation free of a purported conflict of interest. But it just sounds logical that if -- especially when I'm looking at the latest heading out of the case in Illinois -- if this is, in its simplest form, a dispute as to who the beneficiary of this life insurance policy is, I mean that's a -- that's kind of a narrow hearing. We do those types of things in state court. You know, you need some discovery. And then you present the evidence and the judge makes a decision. Kind of like the way you do in contract cases. And so the parties who claim to be beneficiaries of the policy seem to be Simon Bernstein's Irrevocable Trust and their representative. I'm treating Simon Bernstein Trust as the same party for the purpose of this discussion. Eliot, individually, he's there. And no one who may have a voice to say I want,
on behalf of the estate, because there's no PR. If there's a \(P R\) the \(P R\) would take care of that. Especially where Mr. Stansbury is willing to front the cost of the fees for that up front it sounds beneficial to have that voice.

So I'll put it this way, Mr. Brown, I would expand your curator duties, if you're willing, to take the assignment. If not, we got to go elsewhere. It's up to you.

MR. BROWN: The curator duties basically to just effectively be the party who's intervening using Mr. Stansbury's counsel?

THE COURT: No. You would be the party.
You would hire a lawyer. You're allowed to, like in any other case, you and your lawyer can hear, because your phones work and your emails work, from anyone else including Mr. Feaman and Mr. Rose and Mr. Morrissey, and anyone else can stick their two sense in. That's the way litigation goes. But it seems to be that this isn't an issue that's a finger-pointing issue. This is who the beneficiary of the policy is. The judge is going to look at the documents and either say it's clear on its face or else take parol evidence and we're on our way. This
isn't a personal type of litigation. And so, you know, the strategies are legal strategies that would be in charge of you and the lawyer you hire.

MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor. Basically what you just described is something that Mr. Stansbury could very easily do and pay for himself.

THE COURT: Right. But he's -- but I don't want him to be the party to do that because I think there's -- he's a claimant. There's -- I'm not comfortable there.

MR. BROWN: Okay.
THE COURT: And, you know, you're the neutral person looking out for the estate's interest. He has -- he's not -- he's looking out for the estate's interest but in a different manner. So hypothetically if you went up into the litigation and you got convinced by looking at everything you looked at, you and your lawyer, that the beneficiary was the Simon Bernstein Irrevocable Insurance Trust, whatever that is, and not the estate, you have a duty to argue in good faith. You follow what I'm saying? That's where the
neutrality part comes in. But you are more advocating, primarily, to the estate at -that's the assignment.

MR. BROWN: I understand that, Your Honor. But -- and I know there's a lot of buts here -the estate has about 6 to \(\$ 700,000\) worth of assets, that includes the jewelry.

THE COURT: Remember, I'm having Mr. Stansbury pay.

MR. BROWN: Oh, you are having Mr.
Stansbury, okay.
THE COURT: That was the deal.
MR. BROWN: And just using his counsel
that he already has retained and already tried to intervene with?

THE COURT: No. No. You pick the lawyer. He pays.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I will do it subject to whatever personal representative is appointed going ahead and taking over --

THE COURT: Ultimately if we get to the stage where there's a \(P R\) taking the place of you, that would be different. This is -- let me just tell you, I mean a couple of reasons why I think that works is Mr. Brown has worked
with me as curator in a lot of cases. I mean I haven't had one challenge to the reasonableness of the fees ever. He keeps control of the lawyers. You know, and he does really a good job there. So I really, you know, I can't think of a better person to deal with this issue given everyone's competing interest. He'll be fair on what he argues on behalf of the estate. He's not going to run up fees. He's not going to allow the lawyer to run up fees. If you want, I don't think he should be the lawyer probably because I don't think he's admitted in Illinois --

MR. BROWN: No.
THE COURT: -- and he'll be able to best determine how to filter whatever the information is that other counsel want to give to them. Again, it's a narrow issue. Okay, everyone is jumping up. MR. MORRISSEY: If I could respond on behalf of four of the grandchildren. We're now talking about having to pay, you know, from my client's perspective pockets, Mr. Brown's fees, an attorney up in Illinois -THE COURT: I just said that won't be the
case.

MR. MORRISSEY: That could potentially be the case.

THE COURT: It would only be the case if there was a recovery for the estate to which then Mr. Stansbury would say, under the statute, I performed a benefit for the estate. How could that not benefit -- and from what I'm told your clients, the grandchildren, would be the people who would benefit from that. So why would you complain about that if that's what wound up happening? There's not a dollar coming out of the estate unless there's a recovery basically, and then the recovery would take place and he would seek some recovery of fees.

MR. MORRISSEY: And he would seek that --

THE COURT: Here.
MR. MORRISSEY: Here?
THE COURT: Sure. You can say what I think you're going to say, it's okay.

MR. MORRISSEY: I just want to go back to the basics. The fact that the estate is only a taker in default. So the estate doesn't need to be represented in the Illinois action.

It's, for example, there was even talk, I believe, in the Illinois case by one of the banks or insurance companies that it's possible if there's no beneficiary then the State of Illinois could be the taker in default. Well, the State of Illinois wasn't named as a party. They don't have counsel there. Likewise, why should the estate have counsel in an action where they're only the taker of last resort? THE COURT: Because if they're the taker as a matter of law -- I mean -- I don't really follow your argument because let's say there's a hearing, which there will be, and the trust is there, Eliot is there, and the estate is there, and the judge hears it all and says the decision is the beneficiary should be the estate, would we say that that's a ridiculous thing that we had the estate participate? I don't think so.

MR. MORRISSEY: I don't know what -- I mean there is no evidence that anyone on behalf of the estate can present that they have ever been named as a beneficiary --

THE COURT: That could be. It may be then that once Mr. Brown and counsel intervene, see
the documents - I mean you're not talking -how many pages of documents could the beneficiary forms be? It can't be that many. When we sign our life insurance forms we sign a page or two, that's about it. It's not like it's going to be really exotic litigation. This is a narrow, single issue who the beneficiary is of this policy. You know, it may be that it is clear that it's this irrevocable trust and then they'll go from there to see whether that really is an entity that exists. That may be a separate issue. If the judge says -- someone can name on the life insurance policy, you know, the Star Spangled Banner Fund and if that doesn't exist then we know from contract law what happens if you name a beneficiary that doesn't exist. You go to the next level. You certainly want the life insurance funds going somewhere. That's what we would determine if that took place. Step 1, step 2, step 3, doesn't sound to be that complexed. Last word.

MR. ROSE: If I understand what you are saying, which makes sense, Mr. Brown will keep separate time for the time he spends as curator
working on the Illinois issue. He will hire counsel and the fees of Mr . Brown and the Illinois counsel, under his direction and his discretion, would be paid by Mr. Stansbury?

THE COURT: That's the case. Subject to a claim for reimbursement under the statute.

MR. ROSE: I'd want to hear from
Mr. Stansbury under oath that he's willing to undertake that expense. Not to talk out of school, but \(I\) haven't had discussion with counsel and I didn't necessarily get the sense that that was going to be the case. THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Feaman can represent them. MR. FEAMAN: I am representing as an officer of the Court, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. MR. FEAMAN: My only concern is if there's -- basically Mr. Stansbury is funding this there's -- there has to be some type of, I don't want to use the word control, but real input into the process. THE COURT: Well, he's allowed to, like anyone else in cases like this, you could have conversations with Mr. Brown and his lawyer.

You can show them what documents there are. You can ask them to discuss things with them. And, you know, I mean they -- they obviously know he has an interest. And to the extent that they're comfortable I think it's appropriate they'll discuss these things with them.

MR. FEAMAN: On behalf of Mr. Stansbury, I would like assurances.

THE COURT: I'm not going to -- I have to keep the -- there's a line of demarcation \(I\) don't want to cross up front.

MR. FEAMAN: And I'm not objecting that it's not Mr. Stansbury. I just want to make sure the person who --

THE COURT: The person who is appointed is going to advocate for the estate.

MR. FEAMAN: Right. Agree with that.
THE COURT: But let me tell you this, the reason I appoint a curator to do this is the curator is not advocating for Mr. Stansbury. He's advocating for the estate. There's times when the curator could say, after doing everything, \(I\) don't think, for example, the estate has a bona fide interest. That may be
bad news for your side. But if that's what they conclude then that's what they conclude. If they conclude they do they will continue advocating. It's things we do as lawyers all the time. We go after cases with merit, and shy away from those we think don't have merit. MR. FEAMAN: Yes.

THE COURT: There's multilevel here. If someone says that the Bernstein Irrevocable Trust is the beneficiary but that it doesn't exist there may be an argument that could be made how then still as a result of that the estate should get the funds, that would be something that Mr. Brown and counsel could consider advocating. But it's all in good faith stuff.

MR. FEAMAN: Sure. I just want to make sure -THE COURT: You'll get copies of the bills. You'll be able to see what's that. If at anytime you think that Mr. Brown and the lawyer are, you know, going way beyond what you think they should, from an expense point of view, you can always come back to me.

MR. FEAMAN: I'm less concerned with the
expense, although it is important, more with being able to pick up the phone and speak to counsel in Chicago and say, hey, have you considered this, I have information that may help your case.

THE COURT: I'm not going to micromanage that part. Today if you want to call Mr . Brown for this hearing, for example, and say, Mr. Brown, this is what I think, what do you think, you're allowed to have a discussion on that. That happens all the time, doesn't it?

MR. BROWN: It does. It does with everybody in the case, emails and phone calls.

THE COURT: You guys email between each other like crazy now.

MR. BROWN: That's true. Your Honor, the only -- as far as keeping my time, if 1 kept my time at my rate as curator is Mr. Stansbury supposed to pay for that, or is that still payable by the estate?

THE COURT: Your time and the lawyer's
time are the only rate I approve --
MR. BROWN: Paid by Mr. Stansbury.
THE COURT: -- the hourly rate, I approve of 350 .

MR. BROWN: I also propose, it doesn't have to go on the order, it would seem to me, there's nothing wrong, once I retain a Chicago attorney, there's nothing wrong with Mr. Feaman calling that Chicago attorney and me telling the Chicago attorney don't get me on the phone --

THE COURT: I agree. There's no question. You're the conduit.

MR. BROWN: As far as the claim, I'll absolutely rely on Illinois counsel.

THE COURT: All right. I think this is pretty clear how it's going to be handled. Yes, sir.

MR. ROSE: A couple of minor concerns, I think Mr. Brown went too far. Mr. Stansbury would not pay for all the curator fees, only the curator fees directly related to the Illinois matter.

THE COURT: That's what he said. Separate times sheets, sure.

MR. ROSE: I'm concerned if they -- he's going to hire a Chicago lawyer, a Chicago lawyer is going to be expensive. That's what our main concern is --

THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Brown --
MR. ROSE: He's a practical guy --
THE COURT: -- he's going to find a good
lawyer with a reasonable rate, and that's a little higher. He's not going to hire a \$1, 000-an-hour-guy .

MR. ROSE: But if he hires a lawyer and the bill is \(\$ 12,000\) and Mr. Stansbury's counsel looks at it and says we don't think we should pay it, Mr. Brown is retaining the person on behalf of the estate, we need to have not a chance for them to complain about bills.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not worried about that now. There's too much -- I'm not finding, you know -- I mean one -- part of this is what I think is the sincerity of Mr. Feaman's side here. And it's kind of a good thing that we have the ability to be able to use Mr. Stansbury's funds that way. They've made the pledge to do it. I don't think they're going to go back on their word.

MR. ROSE: I understand. I think
Mr. Stansbury should at least, under oath --
THE COURT: Your request is denied.
Mr. Feaman is an officer of the court. He
represents --
MR. ROSE: -- it would be enforceable as a judgment if he doesn't pay -- the estate would have a claim against Mr. Stansbury if he, for example, didn't pay some invoices and we got stuck paying the bill for a Chicago lawyer.

THE COURT: You want me to rule on that now? Your answer is no. You're real premature on that. Draft an order along the lines I mention.

What else for today?
MR. BROWN: Your Honor, I had two motions for instructions.

THE COURT: One had to do with this issue, right?

MR. BROWN: That one I basically just took a backseat to because of the administrator ad litem motion.

The other, Eliot Bernstein sends me a lot of emails with a lot of requests. I'm not saying it's a bad thing. But he asks me questions I don't necessarily know I can answer. For instance, he got the accounting by Tetra and Spallina and then sent me an email that I've attached to the motion. I don't know
if you have the motion for instructions.
THE COURT: I do.
MR. BROWN: That had 44 different questions, not including subparts, and asked that I hire a forensic accountant, an analyst and acquire account statements from a number of third-party institutions.

THE COURT: Is that the motion? I don't have the attachments. It says motion for instructions -- that's the life insurance one. Hold on.

MR. BROWN: It's not necessarily
important. Eliot is very thorough. But, again, the estate has limited assets. My view of what the curator should do with respect to the accounting is not take the lead on objecting to what Tetra and Spallina did, investigating the underpinnings of the accounting, that's up to -- we have a lot of beneficiaries here who are very, very passionate and interested in what's going on with the estate.

THE COURT: Stop. You don't have to go further. That position, that's the law. You don't do that. If there's an accounting,
there's a rule on objections, the parties object. They don't use you -- you don't work for them.

MR. BROWN: Okay.
THE COURT: You work for the court.
MR. BROWN: I'll try and craft an order that deals with that motion in that regard.

Also, there also was a motion, Eliot has concerns about the 2012 will and its validity. I think your ruling would be the same on that. I don't have a role in trying to contest that will --

THE COURT: Exactly. You're not an advocate. You don't investigate things that the parties may be interested in. They can do what they think they need to do based on the rules of procedure and statutes.

MR. BROWN: That's it. MR. ROSE: If I may address the privilege issue?

THE COURT: Okay. The privilege issue, okay.

MR. ROSE: May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes.
MR. ROSE: I can file a copy of this.

This is the email in question. Without reading the email, if you look at who it is addressed to at the very top. Mr. Bernstein is saying, this is Ted, telling me he sent it to Eliot by mistake. Last night at 10:12 he got off an airplane and wanted to tell me things. It's to Eliot by accident. If you just read --

THE COURT: When you say to Eliot by accident, the only person this is sent to is Eliot.

MR. ROSE: Correct. He was trying to send it to me. If you look below the word analysis, the first word of the email is Alan.

THE COURT: So this was is supposed to go to you and it went to Eliot?

MR. ROSE: By mistake. And Mr. Bernstein has advised me this morning he sent it to 2,000 people already. He plans on publicizing it --

THE COURT: I'm sure he didn't do that
because if he wants to participate in the case he's obligated to have and comply with the rules of court.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor --
THE COURT: When you --
MR. BERNSTEIN: I was sent an email to me.

Like I do when I get a letter that has
threatening stuff to me I sent it to my friends who are lawyers. I sent it to a number of people. Actually, I got so busy sending it to people, because it scared me a little bit that it was very threatening to people, that by the time I was done my wife stopped me and said we got to go to court. All I know is my brother sent me an email that seems pretty threatening. It was addressed to me. I was the intended recipient.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, when the email
starts off Alan --
MR. ROSE: I get a million emails --
THE COURT: That say Alan?
MR. BERNSTEIN: That say whoever's name. THE COURT: Okay. All right. You know what, I don't buy anything you just told me.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I thought my brother was sending me a copy of an email --

THE COURT: Stop. Stop. Stop speaking.
I'm going to look at the rule for a second.
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
MR. ROSE: It's 1.285.
THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't been prepared for this, so...

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't looked at the rules.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: I can show you several instances in my email of people sending me letters addressed to other people, several thousands of those.

THE COURT: So, all right. Everyone has to take a deep breath. This situation is done pursuant to Rule 1.285. So Mr. Rose, on your side, correct me if you think I'm wrong, Subsection A says, "When you" -- your client -"takes a position that there's been an inadvertent disclosure of privileged materials to another person" -- which is what you say happened, correct?

MR. ROSE: Correct, sir.
THE COURT: It says here, "In order to assert the privilege the party, person or entity shall, within 10 days of actually discovering the inadvertent disclosure, serve written notice of the assertion of privilege on
the party to whom the materials were disclosed. The notice shall specify with particularity" -etc. And then there's a procedure.

MR. ROSE: I did that last night. I emailed him last night.

THE COURT: I didn't know that. So you gave him the written notice. I assume he got it. Can I see a copy of the notice?

MR. ROSE: I'm trying to get a copy of the notice. Perhaps -- I'm not trying to have the whole argument heard today. I just --

THE COURT: The rule applies.
MR. ROSE: Right.
THE COURT: So once he gets notice, the rule applies. So the notice will have -- you sent it by email?

MR. ROSE: I have it here now. I do find it, sir. May I approach?

THE COURT: What's the time and date of the notice?

MR. ROSE: May 22, 2014 at 11:07 p.m. I said, "You received an email from Ted intended solely for me, and accidentally sent to you by mistake. The email was sent around 10:12 p.m. tonight. Please delete the email immediately
without reading it and confirm that deletion by email. The communication was attorney-client protected and you are not entitled to read or possess the email due to the accidental transmission. Thank you in advance. And if you fail to comply with this request we'll be forced to take corrective action with the court." Signed by me sent to the same email address that --

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So the rule says, to Eliot, he sent that to you, Rule 1.285, Subsection B tells you what you're supposed to do.

MR. BERNSTEIN: I haven't seen it yet.
THE COURT: Okay.
MR. BERNSTEIN: He's saying he sent it
after Ted's email. The last email I read was Ted's email. So I haven't seen it.

THE COURT: So open that email --
MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Okay. And do what the rule says.

MR. BERNSTEIN: Don't send it to anybody else.

THE COURT: Well, okay, that, but it also
says some other things of what you're supposed to do. You're supposed to return or destroy it. That's one thing you're supposed to do. And you are to notify anyone else who you disclosed it to that they're to do the same thing and you're also to take reasonable steps to retrieve the materials disclosed -MR. BERNSTEIN: I'll do all that. THE COURT: And the only exception to this is if you want to challenge that assertion that you were provided an inadvertent privileged matter. And then the rule says what could happen and we can have litigation and spend a lot of money.

MR. BERNSTEIN: No. I'll do whatever it is -- whatever the law says, as always. THE COURT: There's nothing for me to do. MR. ROSE: I understand. I just want to make sure you --

MR. BERNSTEIN: Your Honor, it went out to a lot of people. Like I said, I have a broad base --

THE COURT: Take a look. When you leave the courthouse -MR. BERNSTEIN: Okay. I'll notify
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everybody though.
THE COURT: Go and take a look at the rule and just do what the rule says.

MR. ROSE: And it's not to be posted on social media. THE COURT: You see, I'm not allowed to have dialogue on that now. Other than signing the order, hearing over. Thank you.
(Whereupon the hearing is concluded at 10:00 a.m.)
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# IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY , FLORIDA 

CASE NO.: $502012 C P 004391 X X X X S B$

IN RE:

ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN,

Deceased.

ELIOT IVAN BERNSTEIN, PRO SE

Petitioner(s),

VS.

TESCHER \& SPALLINA, P.A., (and all parties associated and of counsel); ROBERT L. SPALLINA (both personally and professionally); DONALD R. TESCHER (both personally and professionally); THEODORE STUART BERNSTEIN (as alleged personal representative, trustee, successor trustee) (both personally and professionally); et al.,

## Respondent (s) .

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE

HONORABLE MARTIN COLIN

DATE: January 8, 2015

TIME: 9:17 a.m. - 9:58 a.m.

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF WILLIAM E. STANSBURY:
PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A. 3615 W. BOYNTON BEACH BOULEVARD BOYNTON BEACH, FL 33436 By: PETER M. FEAMAN, ESQ.

JEFFREY ROYER, ESQ.

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TED BERNSTEIN: PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD ROSE KONOPKA \& DOW, P.A. 505 SOUTH FLAGLER DRIVE, SUITE 600 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401 By: ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ.

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE PR: CIKLIN LUBITZ 515 N. FLALGER DRIVE, 20TH FLOOR WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401 By: BRIAN M. O'CONNELL, ESQ.

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF MOLLY SIMON,ET AL: JOHN P. MORRISSEY, ESQ. 330 CLEMATIS STREET, SUITE 213 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33401

ELIOT I. BERNSTEIN, Pro se
ALSO PRESENT: CANDICE BERNSTEIN

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before the Honorable MARTIN COLIN, at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 200 West Atlantic Avenue, Room 8, in the City of Delray Beach, County of Palm Beach, state of Florida, on January 8, 2015, to wit:

$$
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
$$

THE COURT: Mr. Bernstein, do you want to do what you're doing at 8:45 or do you want to wait until 9:30?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You mean me?
THE COURT: I mean, whoever has --
MR. FEAMAN: I have an 8:45, Your Honor.
THE COURT: And you would not normally be here for the 9:30?

MR. FEAMAN: That's correct.
THE COURT: All right. Okay. All right.
Okay. We'll take it.
MR. FEAMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.
May it please the court.
THE COURT: I don't have any paperwork, so...
MR. FEAMAN: May I approach, Your Honor?
THE COURT: Sure. Okay.
MR. FEAMAN: Peter Feaman, Your Honor, on behalf of William Stansbury in the Estate of Simon Bernstein.

This is a motion, Your Honor, to relieve Mr. Stansbury of further responsibility of funding what we call the Chicago insurance litigation. Your Honor may recall that while

Mr. Tescher and Spalina were the personal representatives, there was this case going on in Chicago involving $\$ 1.7$ million of life insurance. They, for reasons unknown as yet to the court, did not get the estate involved.

Mr. Stansbury, as you know, is a creditor of the estate. And so he's looking for ways -a substantial creditor, 2.5 million is the claim -- he's looking for ways to get money into the estate, sees that there's this litigation going on in Chicago which could result in all that money coming into the estate.

THE COURT: I remember.
MR. FEAMAN: Okay. And so at this point, Your Honor, the mission has been accomplished, in the sense that the estate was allowed -- has been allowed to intervene, discovery is ongoing. In fact, there is a deposition this week up in Chicago, and the attorneys up in Chicago representing the estate have now said, you know, we'll even take this case on a contingency to benefit the estate, or even a modified contingency, like reduced hourly. THE COURT: What was Mr. Stansbury -- what
was the nature of what he was paying?
MR. FEAMAN: Just a straight hourly.
THE COURT: To the Chicago lawyers?
MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
And now we think we've got the --
THE COURT: What's the status of the case up there?

MR. FEAMAN: Discovery is ongoing. Not yet set for trial.

In discussing this with Mr. O'Connell, who's here, now the full-fledged PR. When we first did this, Ben Brown was the curator, authority is limited.

So in discussing this with Mr. O'Connell, he agrees. He thinks that they can now go forward without --

THE COURT: Did I hear something that you settled?

MR. FEAMAN: We have a signed settlement agreement that Mr. Stansbury has signed. Mr. O'Connell will be coming before the court after notice to every interested party. Mr. O'Connell --

THE COURT: Is everyone on board on the settlement?

MR. O'CONNELL: I'm not sure, Your Honor. Mr. Rose negotiated with Mr. Feaman --

THE COURT: You on board, Mr. Bernstein?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't seen anything yet.

THE COURT: Oh, you haven't seen it yet. Okay. So you say okay to let him off?

MR. O'CONNELL: Let him off because, Your Honor, the solution is this: If we get the settlement agreement approved, hopefully we can --

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. O'CONNELL: -- then that litigation, basically, will go away so some bells and whistles in terms of --

THE COURT: The litigation in --
MR. O'CONNELL: In Chicago.
THE COURT: Meaning, they're going -- the
insurance case is going to settle?
MR. O'CONNELL: Well, it can, in this sense. The real need for it, the driver, at least for me, as the fiduciary, is the fact that it's been mentioned, is a claim against the estate that exceeds the existing assets. Ergo, I can't just turn my back on the fact that there's a potential amount of money to come into the estate. But if
we get the settlement done with Mr. Stansbury, then based on what I've seen, there aren't any other claims that really need attention in that sense. And if I need money, there's a clause in the trust that I can get money from the trust. So I'm pretty much covered in that respect. So that's why I wanted to point out to the court the real solution to this --

THE COURT: Are they still going to pursue the 1.7 million in Chicago?

MR. O'CONNELL: On that, I think I can deal with Mr. Rose, and I can deal with Mr. Morrissey and come up with a way, based on how all this would shake out, and Eliot as well. We might be able to get rid of that litigation. THE COURT: Okay. MR. O'CONNELL: I know it's a little complicated, but it has to do, Judge, with who would sort of get what based on how that litigation turns out. But I think we would be in a much better position, we would have advanced the ball if we can get that accomplished. THE COURT: Eliot, what do you say of Mr. Stansbury's request? ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't seen anything.

THE COURT: No, the --
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Be paid by the estate, yeah.

THE COURT: Mr. Rose?
MR. ROSE: We have the same concerns that we've had from the beginning, which is to not be spending estate assets on this litigation. We had, you know, if you recall, a lengthy hearing and discussion about it. The concern is it's a case where we don't believe the estate has a strong case. And our concern was that you expend estate assets to do it.

THE COURT: Now, I hear that the lawyers up there will do it on a contingency fee for the rest of the case.

MR. ROSE: That's actually something Your Honor raised at the last hearing, which is concern that if you take 40 percent of the money, you know, and give it to lawyers, you're taking it out of the family. If you get rid of Mr. Stansbury --

THE COURT: Mr. Stansbury kind of did this semi-gratuitously to keep the litigation alive. He may have had a personal financial interest, but if he's settling the case and getting out, how can I keep him in paying for that Chicago litigation?

MR. ROSE: That was -- I agree with you. My suggestion is that you would almost defer this until we have the hearing on the approval of the settlement. If the settlement is approved, I agree, Mr. Stansbury should be out completely. And then, as Mr. O'Connell says, if you do the math, if you're going to hire a lawyer on a contingency fee with -- if Mr. Stansbury is out of the picture, if you hire a lawyer on contingency fee and give up 40 percent of the money, or a third of the money, to a lawyer, then no matter how you do the math, it ends up -- everyone ends up worse off. Every single person that is a potential beneficiary --

THE COURT: I obviously would do a contingency fee because the estate and those interested persons don't want to pay hourly. And so it's one or the other, or drop the suit. And drop the suit doesn't seem to be what we want to do at this point. So, you know, if --

MR. ROSE: Our suggestion --

THE COURT: -- the interested people who would have, you know, which are the Bernsteins and Mr. O'Connell, you know, don't want to pay hourly because they don't want to continue to diminish,
you know, the value of the estate, then contingency is what's left.

MR. ROSE: Mr. Morrissey represents four of the individual creditors.

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, John Morrissey here on behalf of the four adult grandchildren. And if I may approach, I'll provide Your Honor with a copy of the excerpts from a hearing that we had wherein Ben Brown was initially appointed, and Your Honor allowed him to go forward with the Illinois litigation on behalf of the estate.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I have a copy of that?
MR. MORRISSEY: I just have this.
At that hearing -- that hearing was on
November 23rd. Your Honor made it absolutely clear that under no circumstances was the estate to pay. And I've highlighted various portions. Your Honor indicates that Mr. Feaman says that his client will not seek fees for his role as administrator ad litem unless and until recovery might take place, and then he'll make application to the funds available.

That was what the deal was, essentially.
And if Your Honor will look then on the bottom of Page 34, top of Page 35, I make
inquiry. We're now talking about having to pay, you know, from my client's prospective profits -- pockets -- Mr. Brown's fees, an attorney up in Illinois. And Your Honor says, I just said that won't be the case. It would only be the case if there was a recovery for the estate to which then Mr . Stansbury would say, under the statute, I performed a benefit to the estate. Your Honor then says there is not a dollar coming out of the estate unless there is a recovery, basically. And then the recovery would take place. And he, meaning Mr. Stansbury, would seek some recovery of fees.

So at that May $23 r d$ hearing -THE COURT: That was before we had a PR and, you know, while we had a curator. Now Mr. Stansbury is getting out. So what are you suggesting we do? MR. MORRISSEY: Well, I mean, either you don't let Mr. Stansbury get out, or, if you do -THE COURT: So hold it. Time out. Your position on behalf of your clients is that Mr. Stansbury purportedly is going to settle the case and he should still pay for the fees up
there? Is that what you're telling me?
MR. MORRISSEY: No. We don't agree with this purported settlement. That's another issue.

THE COURT: I didn't know that.
MR. MORRISSEY: This purported settlement is something that we disagree with.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. MORRISSEY: We vehemently oppose. So my client's position is, we oppose the settlement agreement. Mr. Stansbury represented to the court that, yes, he would go forward and intervene to the conclusion of this litigation. Now, at midstream, he's backing out.

THE COURT: He's not really backing out.
He's saying I'm settling. I'm getting out. I shouldn't continue to pay. That sounds logical. If that happens.

MR. MORRISSEY: He's not settling, though.
THE COURT: But until you just told me that, this side of the room said that there was a settlement agreement that's going to be circulated -- I understand not everyone saw it. I didn't even know there was opposition, at least in principal. So you're the first voice that I've heard that you're opposing it. So, you know, I
mean --

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, there are two things that before Your Honor rules on this motion and allows Mr. Stansbury to withdraw, essentially, in terms of paying fees, there are two things that should happen. Number one, as Mr. Rose said, Your Honor should hear, you know, this settlement issue, and hear the objections to it and determine whether the settlement should go forward. But even before that, Your Honor should hear the Count II of a complaint that Mr. Rose filed. And that is as to the validity of the documents -- the underlying documents themselves.

If I may provide Your Honor --
THE COURT: The underlying documents, which documents are you talking about?

MR. MORRISSEY: All of them. The last will and testament of Shirley Bernstein.

THE COURT: How does that help me decide what to do with this?

MR. MORRISSEY: Well, essentially, everything falls into place after that. Why? Because we don't even know who, ultimately, the beneficiaries are.

So in terms of a settlement, Mr. O'Connell
has filed a motion to approve a settlement. It's theoretically possible that after Your Honor determines the validity of these various documents, my clients might not be beneficiaries. So Your Honor would want to make the determination who's the beneficiaries before Your Honor hears a motion to approve a settlement and knows who can object to that settlement, or agree to it.

And if I may provide Your Honor with a copy of the -- Your Honor's order and the notice of trial that has been filed by Mr. Rose.

Mr. Rose filed a two-count complaint. And that the second count, if you look at Your Honor's order, and specifically Paragraph 3 of that order, says that upon the filing of the answers to Count II -- Count II relates to the validity of the documents themselves -- the court severs Count II --

THE COURT: Okay. I got it. So
Mr. O'Connell, do I have to decide Count II in the amended complaint before you have a clear sense of how to deal with the potential settlement of Mr . Stansbury?

MR. O'CONNELL: I don't think so, Your Honor. And here's why. Because I'm happy to have Mr . Morrissey advocate -- now I'm hearing -- against the settlement because $I$ think that's, frankly, good for the court to hear all sides of this. So if there is some concerns that he has that the court may find valid, that's fine. I don't think there are.

THE COURT: I don't adjudicate sides of settlements. Settlements are outside -MR. O'CONNELL: I guess whatever his objections are.

THE COURT: But those are private to you.
And I think Mr. Feaman agrees with that, correct? MR. FEAMAN: Yes. THE COURT: I mean, I can't -- I'm not going to have a hearing on that.

What about the point that is made that assuming you do have a draft of a settlement agreement that appears to be appropriate. Mr. Morrissey is saying until Count II is adjudicated, you don't even know who the parties are to the settlement who would be in a position to either agree or not agree with it. MR. O'CONNELL: Actually, we know who the
parties are, Your Honor, because it would be we have Mr. Stansbury as the claimant and then myself as the defendant.

THE COURT: Estate.
MR. O'CONNELL: Right. Those are the parties. And then --

THE COURT: Then you have interested people who may or may not agree?

MR. O'CONNELL: Right. Who are here.
THE COURT: Who may or may not be interested, depending on Count II, according to what Mr. Morrissey says.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think it's important enough, Your Honor, just from the standpoint of getting this estate moving towards a conclusion.

THE COURT: Right. True.
MR. FEAMAN: That settlement really does handle a number of important matters.

THE COURT: All right. Here's how I'm going to do this. Is the settlement between the estate and Mr. Stansbury in a final form yet?

MR. O'CONNELL: It is. We just need some hearing time, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It's circulated --
MR. O'CONNELL: It's signed by Mr. Stansbury,

Your Honor.
THE COURT: And signed by you, Mr. O'Connell, or will be?

MR. O'CONNELL: Will be, once it's approved.
THE COURT: SO --
MR. O'CONNELL: And drafted by Mr. Rose.
THE COURT: You two are the two main parties to the settlement, correct?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. And it was drafted by Mr. Rose, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Hold on. Let me finish what I'm going to say. And so there will be a motion to approve the settlement. Okay. Notice will go to all interested persons, who are here. And they have a right then to tell me if they object. And I can hear whether or not I think they have standing to object, and all those other things that I normally hear at a hearing like that?

Yes, Eliot?
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If I'm going to be asked to accept or deny that --

THE COURT: You get service.
MR. O'CONNELL: He will.
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I think it's between the other --

THE COURT: Yeah, they're the main parties, but they'll serve you with --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: If $I$ have to do that, $I$ have children that have a conflict of my interests versus theirs and that. They would need representative counsel to sign off on it.

THE COURT: You have a conflict with your children on that?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On that particular issue. THE COURT: I don't know, you know, so -ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So they would need counsel and I don't -- I would ask the estate to provide that if they're asking us to sign off.

MR. FEAMAN: If I may, Your Honor. There is a whole issue as to whether the children even have standing before this court because, as Mr. Rose has alleged, the trustee, his client, is the sole beneficiary of the estate.

THE COURT: I got that part. Okay. So here's the way that works. I mean, anyone can appear who says they are interested at the hearing on the motion to approve settlement. You know, they can appear pro se or through counsel. Whoever shows up, I determine who are you, do you have standing. And then if there is standing,
then I'll hear what the basis of the objection is.
So the children can -- if you say are -- if you think they are independently interested persons, they can hire counsel.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: They're minors.
THE COURT: They can appear themselves. If they want to take that position. But I can't, at 8:45 today, direct the estate to pay for their lawyer. I can't do that. I mean, that's beyond what I'm allowed to do.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'll check with the estate. THE COURT: You can talk to counsel about that.

All right. Then -- so how quickly can that be done?

MR. O'CONNELL: Today, I can circulate it.
THE COURT: Okay. So I'm going to make this a priority matter and I'm going to give you a hearing time on a motion to approve.

And then what I'll do is, depending upon that hearing, which I'm going to have right away, I'll deal with the issue of Mr. Stansbury's request to be discharged.

And I'm not saying, though, that his discharge is solely tied into whether the
settlement is accepted.
MR. FEAMAN: That's correct, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I have to independently decide whether I think it's appropriate that he continue to fund the litigation. It's never -- never like a life jail sentence type of thing, you know, there's always -- it's an interlocutory order that could be modified.

MR. FEAMAN: Right.
THE COURT: I mean, let's, you know, keep in mind what I'm thinking. Okay.

MR. FEAMAN: Yeah, because I --
THE COURT: How much time do you think you need? $I$ got it.

MR. FEAMAN: I respectfully suggest to the court that there is no compulsion for Mr. Stansbury to do anything with regard to the Chicago litigation.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll take a look. I mean, I've got a grasp of what's going on.

How much time do you think you need, collectively, to have a hearing?

MR. MORRISSEY: To approve the settlement.
THE COURT: I mean, if there's going to be standing and/or substantive objections, I need
time to be able to hear that.

MR. ROSE: I'm not going to shed a brief light on that. They said that $I$ drafted the agreement. I did actually, on behalf of the -Ted, as trustee, I explored settlement with Mr. Stansbury to the point of you need to know what the number is so you can go to the beneficiaries and sort of take their pulse. If it's a dollar, it's one thing. If it's two billion dollars --

THE COURT: Whoever did the drafting of it doesn't matter to me.

MR. ROSE: My point to you was, though, I did get a sense that at least seven of the beneficiaries are theoretically against the settlement.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: So I didn't proceed forward with the settlement. And I didn't have a chance to speak to Mr. Eliot Bernstein about his position, but he's been opposed to many things, but... THE COURT: No, Eliot doesn't do that. He rarely opposes anything. That's my recollection of it.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Last hearing I didn't
object to it.
THE COURT: Eliot has turned a new leaf,
haven't you noticed?
MR. ROSE: I haven't, unfortunately.
THE COURT: I have.
MR. ROSE: Seven out of ten are opposed so I think you may get some -- you may get a significant amount of objection to the settlement.

THE COURT: I just need to know how much
time. How much time?
MR. ROSE: Ninety minutes, maybe.
MR. O'CONNELL: Hour and a half, John?
THE COURT: Hold on. I'm filling up this
week very quickly. We want to do this right away, so let's take a look here. I mean, can you be ready by the 27 th? I can give you two hours. And you probably heard, I gave three dates to that other case ahead of you, I'll just take away the date that I give you folks.

MR. O'CONNELL: 27th is fine for me, Your
Honor .
THE COURT: Three to five. I'll give you two hours. Take a look at your calenders, see if that works.

MR. FEAMAN: We're fine.

MR. ROSE: I can be there.
MR. MORRISSEY: I think so. I don't have my calendar, but I'm pretty sure I can.

THE COURT: All right. So you folks have that. All right. So $I$ got to -- okay. So you have that on the -- and I'm going to call it motion for settlement.

MR. O'CONNELL: Sure.
THE COURT: Do a notice of hearing 3:00 to 5:00, January 27th. Okay. And let me just make a note for the other case now. Hold on.

Okay. Yes.
MR. ROSE: Just briefly. To follow up with what Mr. Morrissey said, though, his count --

THE COURT: I'm not - -
MR. ROSE: I was going to mention Mr. O'Connell and I've discussed the issue. He's, I think, of the opinion it's important to get a resolution on the validity of the documents, although it doesn't have to be tied to the Stansbury motion. I just wanted to point out, I've actually discussed the issue with Mr. O'Connell.

THE COURT: So we need to give a trial date on Count II?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. And I agree with that, Your Honor. That's correct.

THE COURT: How much time?
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What case is that in?
THE COURT: What case is that in? It's in 14CP3698.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's a separate case, right?

THE COURT: Yeah.
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Than what we're here for. We're here on Simon.

THE COURT: Let's see.
MR. ROSE: It's technically a trust
construction case.
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm not ready for that yet because we have to see if the trustee is fit to argue that case first.

THE COURT: I'm just trying --
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We should have that first like we've been trying to.

THE COURT: But we have hearing dates on other things. But let me ask you this. How much time do you need for the trial on that?

MR. ROSE: Half a day, at most, because there is no evidence. You know, if he has to present
evidence that the documents are invalid --
THE COURT: All right. So --
MR. ROSE: And it is a pretty important
threshold issue.

THE COURT: It's at issue?
MR. ROSE: It's at issue.
THE COURT: Ready for trial?
MR. ROSE: Ready for trial. We noticed it for trial.

THE COURT: Well, I know that. But ready -you can notice something ready for trial -- is it ready now for trial? All the reasonable discovery that has to be made has been made?

MR. ROSE: I'm prepared to try the case. I don't know how much Mr. Bernstein -THE COURT: So who are the other parties in that case? MR. ROSE: Mr. O'Connell would like to intervene in the case soley because he's the personal representative of the estate. And this will decide who the beneficiaries are of the estate. So he has an interest in it. But he's indicated that he wants to -- he wants to be involved, but he's not going to necessarily be actively litigating it.

THE COURT: So who else --
MR. O'CONNELL: Correct.
THE COURT: So these -- let me look at the defendants. Looks like a bunch of children. So is that -- Mr. Morrissey, are you the defendant's.

MR. MORRISSEY: For four of those. Molly -THE COURT: And some of these, are they Eliot's children?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Minors. Who are unrepresented.

THE COURT: Okay. And then your clients?
MR. MORRISSEY: Four.
THE COURT: And then who are the other
children?
MR. ROSE: Everyone else defaulted. They defaulted in the sense that they're not taking a position that they're going to rely on what Your Honor rules. So it's technically, I think, at issue. And it would go a long way to resolving a lot of issues, like, who has standing to do various things.

THE COURT: So tell me this. What hearings, other than the one set for -- one second. So let me ask you this. Today's 9:30 on the motion for instructions, what's that about? That's the
estate case, correct?
MR. O'CONNELL: It is.
THE COURT: Is that related to this, or not?
MR. O'CONNELL: The estate, but not to the litigation, Your Honor. But we need to hear it later.

THE COURT: So what hearings do we have that are special set now coming up?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We need the hearing to remove Ted first.

THE COURT: There is no date for that? ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Still serving the complaint.

THE COURT: Because there was an amendment on the complaint.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So there's -- then there's -- still serving two of the parties.

THE COURT: So is there a -- is there a removal action to remove Ted as trustee of Shirley's trust?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes.
THE COURT: That's been pending for a while?
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah, we can hear that.
THE COURT: There's been amendments to that.
MR. ROSE: There was actually a recent filing
of a -- there's been a motion to dismiss served directed to it. He hasn't served all the other people. It's not at issue and it's not going to be at issue for a significant period of time. I think what Mr. O'Connell feels, and what $I$ feel, and what Mr. Morrissey feels, and the other beneficiaries are, that -- first of all, if you rule that the documents are invalid, then you don't have to remove Ted because he doesn't ever get appointed if the documents go away. So that's, you know, sort of the cart before the horse. And the other thing is, you need to get a ruling on the validity of these five documents that are being challenged, only by Eliot, as to the validity, and, I assume, testamentary capacity. And whether Ted is the trustee or -then you have Mr. O'Connell -- that needs to be tried.

THE COURT: I got it. I understand. Okay. MR. ROSE: And then the removal can happen in its ordinary course. THE COURT: Go ahead. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: The problem is that you have to have the hearing to remove Ted as successor because then he can't argue that case.

And somebody will have to be appointed to come in and argue these things that only these guys seem to want to argue. So if Ted doesn't survive, then a qualified trustee, somebody else will be appointed who will then decide if we're going to have this or if they're going to concede the documents are a fraud.

THE COURT: If it's a hearing to decide validity of documents, and everyone else is going to be participating, including yourself, I don't see why I can't have that hearing.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Because Ted -- we can have it, but they shouldn't be allowed to -- Ted has conflicting interests in the outcome of this. THE COURT: You know, I can take that into consideration at the hearing.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay. That's fine. I'm good with that.

THE COURT: I do all that. That's part of what I'll -- you know, it's not only what's said, but who says it, and what --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So, yeah, then let's have that hearing to remove Ted.

THE COURT: Because here's what $I$ want to do. I want to start giving hearing dates that are --
where we can get some orders and move this estate along. Because I think that's important. Okay. So --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: In the last hearing you said you would hear the petition to remove Ted. You ordered it, actually.

THE COURT: I wanted that heard a while ago --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Then we'll hear the document stuff, if he survives?

THE COURT: Yeah, but here's the thing, your case got -- I thought I had given a hearing date on that petition to remove and then you amended, I think, isn't that what happened?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: No.
MR. ROSE: You denied the petition because it was improperly filed. He just started a complaint in which there are --

THE COURT: Don't talk over each other.
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
MR. ROSE: He's just filed a new complaint. We have just filed motions to dismiss. There's other parties that haven't been served. And I think Mr. O'Connell is involved in --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's in Sy.

MR. ROSE: Mr. O'Connell is involved in --
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's in Sy, not Shirley.
THE COURT: All right. Here's what I'm
doing. I'm going to give you your half a day trial date on Count II in this 3698 case. I mean, I'm not going to give it to you now, I'll have my assistant look at my calendar and give you a half a day.Eliot

MR. ROSE: That's fine.
THE COURT: Eliot, as soon as you're able to serve and do what you can in Shirley --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm ready.
THE COURT: -- you get on whatever you file in any of the cases --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: On Sy. Okay. But on Shirley I'm ready to have the petition heard.

THE COURT: Is that ready to be heard, the petition in the Shirley case?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Let's have it heard the same day.

MR. ROSE: There's a motion to dismiss directed to that.

THE COURT: Well, then get that set for hearing. Okay. I mean, let me start hearing, knocking out the things --

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's the order you wanted. That's the order you ordered.

THE COURT: The hearing date on a motion to dismiss is easier to get than a half-day trial date. So it will work out.

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: Any objection to the PR intervening in this 3698 case, which is Ted versus the children?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I haven't even read this thing. I just got it. Did you send this out prior to this?

MR. O'CONNELL: I believe we did.
ELIOT BERNSTEIN: We got a notice for the hearing. We didn't get the document attached with it.

THE COURT: You want -- tell you what. You want, like, I'm going to take some other people, you want to look at it?

ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Actually, I do, because we don't know what it was.

MR. ROSE: Our position, just for the record is --

THE COURT: Are you okay with him intervening?

MR. ROSE: If I can -- I have discussed the issue with Mr. O'Connell. I'm concerned that, you know, a lot of estate resources not be expended -I discussed with Mr. O'Connell. He's intervening because he wants to protect his right as $P R$ because he needs to know who the beneficiaries are.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: So if he's not going to be spending a lot of money on the thing to be involved in it, we have no objection on that basis.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Morrissey, you okay with that?

MR. MORRISSEY: The objection -- my objection would have been the same. I haven't spoken with Mr. O'Connell, but to the extent that -- all beneficiaries are going to be presumably arguing in the clause, and so everyone - - every beneficiary's rights are represented. I don't know that we need extra resources.

THE COURT: I'm going to let him intervene, subject to Eliot saying no. So talk to him about that.

MR. O'CONNELL: Sure.
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THE COURT: Give me the order and I'll sign that before you're done with your 9:30.

MR. O'CONNELL: Okay.
THE COURT: All right. So then Mr. Feaman, I'm going to defer on your motion until I rule on the 27 th. And then bring that back and I'll rule on it at that time.

MR. FEAMAN: Okay.
THE COURT: And just kind of, you know -- all right. That finishes your 8:45. Okay. Any other 8:45's? MR. O'CONNELL: There are no other 8:45's. (Thereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 9:58 a.m.)
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```
IN THE FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT
    IN AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA
                CASE NO: 502012CP4391XXXXNB
```

IN RE: ESTATE OF SIMON L. BERNSTEIN

Deceased.

-     -         -             -                 -                     -                         -                             -                                 -                                     -                                         -                                             -                                                 -                                                     -                                                         -                                                             -                                                                 -                                                                     -                                                                         -                                                                             -                                                                                 -                                                                                     -                                                                                         -                                                                                             -                                                                                                 -                                                                                                     -                                                                                                         -                                                                                                             -                                                                                                                 -                                                                                                                     -                                                                                                                         -                                                                                                                             -                                                                                                                                 -                                                                                                                                     -                                                                                                                                         -                                                                                                                                             -                                                                                                                                                 -                                                                                                                                                     -                                                                                                                                                         -                                                                                                                                                             - /

PROCEEDINGS BEFORE HONORABLE JOHN PHILLIPS

DATE: September 15, 2015

TIME: 9:27 a.m. to 10:32 a.m.

1 APPEARANCES:

2

11 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF MOLLY SIMON, et al:

12 JOHN MORRISSEY, ESQ. MORRISSEY LAW

13330 Clematis Street, 213
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE:

APPEARING OF BEHALF OF WILLIAM STANSBURY:

PETER FEAMAN, ESQ.
PETER M. FEAMAN, P.A.
3695 Boynton Beach Blvd., Suite 9
Boynton Beach, FL 33436

25

15 APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TED $S$. BERNSTEIN:

16 ALAN B. ROSE, ESQ.
PAGE, MRACHEK, FITZGERALD \& ROSE, P.A.
17505 S. Flagler Drive, Suite 600
West Palm Beach, FL 33401
18

19

20
KENNETH S. POLLOCK, ESQ.
SHENDELL \& POLLOCK, P.L.
212700 N. Military Trail, Suite 150
Boca Raton, FL 33431
22

23

24
14

APPEARING ON BEHALF OF TESCHER \& SPALLINA:

ALSO PRESENT: Eliot Bernstein

BE IT REMEMBERED, that the following proceedings were taken in the above-styled cause before Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, at the Palm Beach County Courthouse, 3188 PGA Blvd., Palm Beach Gardens, County of Palm Beach, state of Florida, on Tuesday, the 15 th day of September, 2015 , to wit:

THE COURT: We're here on the simon Bernstein case; is that right?

MS. FOGLIETTA: Yes, Judge.
THE COURT: This ended up in this division of the Court because of a recusal from somebody else in another division of the Court, right?

MR. FEAMAN: That raises an interesting point. Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury, a creditor of the estate. I was late coming in. Mr. O'Connell is late. All the attorneys and the litigants are either in West Palm or south. I respectfully don't understand how we ended up here in the north branch. Should we set it back to the main branch?

THE COURT: No. That would be judge shopping. When somebody recuses themselves then it's randomly reassigned. I was verifying
this isn't a case that started out with me. It's a case that started out with somebody else.

MR. FEAMAN: Judge Colin, actually, specifically said in his recusal order north branch, which $I$ didn't understand.

THE COURT: That's what the 4 th DCA is for. I'm not here to question some other judge's order. You won't have me saying he was wrong. I'm not the appellate judge. If somebody made a mistake and you all think there's relief that should be granted to correct his mistake that's what the 4 th is for. Please have a seat.

We're here because somebody else is not the judge in the case anymore and $I$ am, right? MR. FEAMAN: Right. THE COURT: We'll go to the next step. This is a case management conference. What is it that $I$ need to do to manage the case? I received the trustees' status report which is lengthy and comprehensive. I've read that. Other than being brought up to speed by having read that report what else needs to be resolved to get this case done?

MR. ROSE: Good morning. I'm Alan Rose. Can I speak from here?

THE COURT: You can. MR. ROSE: I'm not planning on doing the whole hearing, but briefly there are, technically, four other cases that all were assigned. I think we've noticed a status conference in all four cases.

There are two estates. The Simon Bernstein that Your Honor mentioned, he died in 2012 .

THE COURT: Then there's the wife who pre-deceased him, has a case, and I've been asked to consider -- one of the things that needs to be done is the closing of that estate. MR. ROSE: Correct. She died in 2010. Each of those estates builds into a trust, so there's technically four pieces of pending litigation; an estate of Shirley, a Shirley trust construction, and an estate of Simon and claim in the simon trusts for the removal of my client. Those are the four separate matters. And then we came before you -- when Judge Colin recused himself there were pending motions counsel thought best to come and get some sort
of order.
The one thing that we believe, at least which was in the status report which should be addressed fairly early on, is whether we're going to have a guardian ad litem for the three minor children that are represented by Eliot Bernstein, and try to bring some order to this case which $I$ think was a little bit out of control in Judge Colin's courtroom.

THE COURT: Is there a motion for appointment of a GAL? Has a motion been filed by someone?

MR. ROSE: I think the -- my understanding is the beneficiaries were about to file one. I don't think they filed yet. There is a pending motion to appoint an attorney for the children. It's sort of a similar issue. Maybe Mr. O'Connell can -- it's on one of his lists of motions.

And then there's -- I think the main thing we need to discuss is what order we're going to do the hearings in because along with the guardian ad litem it's our position the first thing we should decide, since almost every motion you're going to hear on Mr . O'Connell's
list is filed by Eliot Bernstein, is he's not a beneficiary. We have a one-count complaint to determine the validity of the documents. And under the documents, as drafted, he's disinherited. He's not a beneficiary under any way and if you remove his standing then $I$ believe we can go to mediation and resolve almost all of these motions without taking up, probably, two or three weeks of the Court's time.

THE COURT: Well, I noticed in the trustee's status report that there was mentioned several times that he's not a beneficiary. So has there been an order that establishes that or is that just the position that's being argued by the --

MR. ROSE: Well, the documents themselves, the operative document, for example, simon Bernstein's will -- the sole beneficiary is the trust. Simon Bernstein's trust the soul beneficiaries are his ten grandchildren. Shirley Bernstein's will, the sole beneficiary is her trust. Shirley Bernstein's trust gave Simon Bernstein the power of appointment to appoint and he appointed to his grandchildren.

So what we filed was a one-count complaint to determine those documents. We actually filed a trust construction action. Judge Colin advised us to file - to add a count. We added one count to determine the validity of those documents. It's been answered by everybody, and what Judge Colin did was he severed that one count from everything else and he stayed everything else until we resolved that one count. That's the issue that we believe, if you resolve that issue first, a lot of the stuff would go away and that was part of the purpose of the status conference. The parties can't, among themselves, agree what issues should be heard first. If you did that issue, either if he has standing or he doesn't, if he doesn't have standing we'll good through hundreds of thousands of dollars of legal fees resolving motions that he filed if he lacked standing.

I think if you couple it with a motion for a guardian ad litem there is a motion pending in a fifth case, the Oppenheimer case, that's also before you, not today, for a guardian ad litem. Judge Colin deferred on that. I
believe Mr. Morrissey's clients are going to move for a guardian ad litem. I believe Mr. Eliot Bernstein, in his papers, has indicated that he has a conflict with his children and they should have a lawyer and a guardian representing them. He can speak for himself to that point.

Those are the two issues we think should go first. If it happens first this case would become much more manageable and can even be resolved because, as we indicated in our report, these are relatively small estates.

There was a belief that's driving this that there was $\$ 100$ million left behind but they left behind modest estates. Over time we've been trying to sell property and trying to narrow things and all we've been doing is spending attorneys' fees between a curator --

THE COURT: I just want to figure out what's on the judicial plate that needs to be addressed.

MR. ROSE: That's what we think should happen first, those two issues, and everything else will fall into place.

THE COURT: What is the name or where is
the document to be found that has this single count for determination of validity of estate documents or trust documents that was severed out by Judge Colin?

MR. ROSE: It's in case 5020143698 --
THE COURT: What are the two letters in between the 14 and the 36 MR. ROSE: I'm sorry, CPOO3698XXX and now

THE COURT: I don't need that stuff. What's the docket entry number?

MS. FOGLIETTA: The filing number?
THE COURT: I want to know where to find this thing that seems to be one of the first things --

MS. FOGLIETTA: Are you talking about the amended complaint? I have a copy.

MR. ROSE: Just the docket entry, if you don't mind.

THE COURT: I have a computer here so don't think I'm being rude if $I$ look away from you all.

MR. ROSE: It was filed October 3, 2013. MS. FOGLIETTA: I have a copy. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I make an
objection?
THE COURT: Who are you?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm Eliot Bernstein.

THE COURT: You can't object yet.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Can I make a
statement?

THE COURT: Not yet. I'm looking at this computer screen trying to find the docket. Everybody, please be seated. You're making me nervous.

I'm just scrolling through the attorneys. I haven't even gotten to the pleadings yet. I'm looking for a pleading or an order entered October 3rd.

MR. ROSE: An amended complaint.
THE COURT: I have an amended complaint by Ted Bernstein. MR. ROSE: Yes.

THE COURT: And in that amended complaint is the count that was referred to. It's Count II?

MR. ROSE: I believe it is, Sir.
THE COURT: All right.
MR. ROSE: Page 13 is the actual - the count itself incorporates the allegations and
the documents.
THE COURT: All right. Count II starts at Paragraph 79 of the document?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. And then at some point in time you say Judge Colin severed out this count and said it should be heard separately. Is that --

MR. ROSE: He severed it and stayed --
THE COURT: Do you know when the order was entered on that?

MR. ROSE: 10-6 according to the chart from --

THE COURT: 10-6-14?
MR. ROSE: Yes. It says order on amendments to pleadings. There might be an order that predates that.

MS. FOGLIETTA: I do have a copy of it.
THE COURT: The other is almost the very next docket entry. The amended petition is Docket Entry 26. The order is Docket Entry 27.

MR. ROSE: Specifically Paragraph 3 on Page 2.

THE COURT: There was a response filed by Mr. Bernstein and the other defendants. Are
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those things that happened?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What case? Is this Shirley Bernstein --

THE COURT: Case Number 14CP3698.
MR. ROSE: Everyone has either answered or been defaulted and I noticed the case for trial.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are we here for Simon Bernstein? I'm confused. I'm not prepared for Shirley Bernstein's case today. Can I raise another point, Your Honor?

THE COURT: I only do one thing at a time.
You must stop.
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: What?
THE COURT: You must stop. I do one thing at a time. You're not that thing yet.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: This is a case management conference. I'm not deciding anything. I do decide that I'm the one that runs this courtroom so I don't have people jumping up and blurting things out. That doesn't help me orderly go through figuring out what the problem is and how to attack and resolve the problem. My specialty is wrestling stuff to
the ground and resolving it. That's what I'm going to do in this case and that's what $I$ do in every case. This is a bigger one to wrestle to the ground than some other ones but there's no octopus case that I've ever met that I haven't been able to figure out sooner or later. The only way $I$ can do that is talk to one person at a time. We'll figure out one thing at a time. I'm not a smart guy but I'm persistent. All these guys know me. I'm looking you in the eye because you haven't met me before, right? Sir, yes, you haven't met me?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Okay. So you don't know me. These other attorneys do because they're in court in front of me on other cases where I've done the same thing. I'm too stupid to -well, I'm stupid. I take one thing at a time and I make sure $I$ know what I'm doing and I go to the next thing. I try to be courteous to everybody. I try to make sure everybody is heard. I demand that people be courteous to me in return. I don't take any crap. In that method of proceeding we get through whatever is
uncomfortable, whatever is messed up, whatever is complex. We simplify it down enough for me to understand it and then we resolve it. That's what is going to happen in this case. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: So my question is -THE COURT: I told you I'm not talking to you yet. $I$ was talking to you to tell you what I'm doing so you're not mystified, but now you sit silently until it's my time to talk to you. Right now I'm talking to some other people. Okay, so --

MR. ROSE: May I approach --
THE COURT: -- the trustees believe the
first thing that needs to be done is the resolution of this order that was entered by Judge Colin severing out the count and the amended complaint that deals with the validity of the testamentary documents, correct?

MR. ROSE: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: All right. Does anybody
object to that issue being resolved first in the order of events in this sequence of cases? MR. O'CONNELL: Are you ready for me? THE COURT: Yeah, $I$ just want to know if there's any objection to having that issue
heard and resolved first. That's the issue that I'm chewing on right now.

MR. O'CONNELL: Okay. I wouldn't call it an objection, but I'd like to be able to explain my role in it and these other motions.

THE COURT: Well, first $I$ want to know if there's any reason $I$ should attack this as the first order of business in setting a trial or hearing to have it resolved. Do you have any objection?

MR. O'CONNELL: I wouldn't object to that.
THE COURT: All right. Does anybody else seated at the tables have any objection?

MR. FEAMAN: May it please the Court. Peter Feaman on behalf of William Stansbury. He's a $\$ 2.5$ million creditor of the estate of Simon Bernstein.

We're here in the estate of simon Bernstein and it's the position of Mr. Stansbury that a removal of Ted Bernstein as successor trustee should be heard first.

THE COURT: Okay. Why?
MR. FEAMAN: The reason for that is if that issue is determined one way or the other we believe that is the linchpin to then
resolving probably all the other issues in this case.

THE COURT: The trustee believes the issue to resolving many of the issues is to determine whether Eliot -- I'm using first names, I'm sorry. Is it Mr. Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You can call me Eliot.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't mean to be disrespectful. I don't want to do that.

The trustee's thought is that resolving whether Eliot has any standing to be involved in the litigation is key. You're saying that's not key, it's something else that's key? What else is it that you're suggesting is the key issue to be resolved?

MR. FEAMAN: Because that's the Shirley Bernstein trust. The matter that is before Your Honor today is the estate of Simon Bernstein, and Simon Bernstein had a separate trust which was different from the Shirley Bernstein trust and the -- most of the assets are in the simon Bernstein trust which then had the pour-over will into -- most of the assets are in the Simon Bernstein estate and then had
the pour-over will into the trust and that's -that's the matter that is the most significant, in my humble opinion, that is before Your Honor is the simon Bernstein estate and the simon Bernstein trust. It's the opinion of Mr. Stansbury that Mr. Ted Bernstein, as a successor trustee to the Simon Bernstein trust, should be heard first.

THE COURT: Let me ask this: How is it that there is an order by Judge Colin severing out this count about the validity of some estate documents in the simon Bernstein case if the documents in question were filed in a different estate? Maybe the trustee can address that. MR. ROSE: Sure. THE COURT: What's up with that? MR. ROSE: We have a trust construction count that was to determine the validity and then the construction of the Shirley Bernstein trust. Within that claim, because there's an overlap of issues there, the standing issue is the same in both. What Judge Colin ordered me to do was to file an additional count into that complaint. Everyone was properly noticed. We
already had the jurisdiction over all the beneficiaries, those that answered, those that did not. Nobody moved to dismiss upon the ground that it's not properly in one case, and so because there's a direct overlap between documents that were executed and the validity of those documents, and the validity of the will of Simon directly relates to the validity of the exercise of power of appointment because he exercised his power through his will. So what Judge Colin did was he ordered me to file a simple one-count complaint, as simple as it could be, list the four documents and allege that they're all valid and enforceable. In the context of trying that issue you will decide whether, for example, simon Bernstein was unduly influenced, if that's an allegation, to execute the power of appointment. The power of appointment is what deprives Mr. Eliot Bernstein of standing. Judge colin ordered us all put it all in this count. He then stayed everything else and severed that and we're supposed to try that and we get bogged down constantly in --

THE COURT: Don't get sidetracked or I'll
get confused and disaster happens.
Mr. Bernstein, Eliot Bernstein, you've got an objection to the trial of the issue about the validity of the estate documents that's just been discussed?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes, sir.
THE COURT: What's your objection?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Several, with that being the first thing. The first part is that Mr. O'Connell has filed with the court in the Simon Bernstein estate nothing to be done with Ted Bernstein as trustee because Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Feaman, two prominent lawyers that you know, have claimed that the document itself that they're operating under precludes Ted Bernstein from being a trustee. The language says he can't be a related party --

THE COURT: You got to get back to my question

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Here's the problem

THE COURT: No. I'm the one that's telling you the question I'd like you to answer. Remember $I$ told you $I$ chew on one tiny thing at a time. $I$ don't want to get confused.

I might make a mistake if $I$ get confused.
This is the thing I'm trying to establish in my mind now: What is your objection to trying the issue about the validity of the estate documents that are found in count II of the amended petition, Docket Entry Number 26? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: My problem is is that if Ted is not a trustee properly serving, and a fraudulent trustee as they're claiming and he's acting improperly, to have a hearing where Ted's arguing validity where he's conflicted, $I$ mean if he doesn't argue successfully, his entire family and children are cut out of everything. so he's got a conflict in arguing a construction --

THE COURT: You're not even addressing my question. Thank you. Please be seated. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I did answer your question because how can we have -- how can we hear his --

THE COURT: You're asking me a question. Your question started with how do we do something. I don't know.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I'm saying we can't hear --

THE COURT: Stop. Please be seated. You failed to answer my question. You got something else on your mind that doesn't address what I'm trying to figure out.

Is it true that Judge Colin issued a stay order on the other parts of the litigation and it intended -- somehow he manifested an intention to resolve the validity of the estate documents? Is there an order that says that somewhere?

MR. ROSE: I think that goes too far. There are multiple proceedings. He severed this count --

THE COURT: I got that.

MR. ROSE: It's our view that that should be what is decided --

THE COURT: I know. But you said a minute ago that he stayed other proceedings. Is there an order that says that? Where do $I$ find that order?

MR. ROSE: It's the one that you looked at, October 6th. It stays the rest of the proceedings inside the shirley Bernstein trust construction case. It doesn't stay everything in the Simon Bernstein side.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. ROSE: That's what $I$ was clarifying.
THE COURT: Okay. You've been living with
these cases for several years.
MR. ROSE: Yes.
THE COURT: I've been living with them for 30 minutes so I'm not as intimately familiar with the ins and outs of what's going on here. I'm not even familiar with everybody's names, so $I$ apologize to you for that.

Well, then there's no reason for me not to set a trial on that Count II of the amended complaint, right? I'll do that whether everybody wants me to do or not that way I'll get something done and that way we'll move down the road. That will be done. Court to order set. How much time you think we need to try that?

MR. ROSE: Normally $I$ would think we can try the case within a day.

THE COURT: Okay. Anybody think we need a different amount of time?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah. I think it will take several days. THE COURT: Why?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, you're going to have to first start with is Ted Bernstein a valid trustee to argue the case. So that's --

THE COURT: No, I won't have to decide that.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: You want somebody to argue who's not valid --

THE COURT: What else? Any other issue? Is there any other issue that's going to take more than a day?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Well, it's very complicated.

THE COURT: No, this isn't going to be complicated.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
THE COURT: It's not. There's documents, pieces of paper that somebody claims were executed or not executed.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: There's been fraud in the document.

THE COURT: I was explaining to you something. If you interrupt me you can be held in contempt. If I interrupt you I'm keeping order in my courtroom. You see the difference there? This is not a conversation. Okay. No
need for me to explain anything further. I intend to set this for trial. I intend to set it for a day. I intend that issue of the validity of the estate documents will be resolved in that trial. Is there any reason to not think $I$ can do that in a day other than what Mr. Eliot Bernstein has mentioned?

MR. FEAMAN: On behalf of Mr. Stansbury we have no involvement in the Shirley Bernstein estate.

THE COURT: So you don't care what $I$ do. MR. ROSE: Mr. O'Connell is a party, he's intervening because of the overlap of the power of appointment. I can't speak for him but I want to make sure he agrees that a day is enough. We are all bad estimators.

THE COURT: I asked this question to the entire courtroom. If anybody thinks differently then what I'm getting ready to do you're supposed to say something. He hasn't said anything.

MR. MORRISSEY: Judge, John Morrissey. I represent four of the adult grandchildren who will ultimately be beneficiaries under the trust document.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. MORRISSEY: So certainly my clients have an interest here in what's going on. I just want to let Your Honor know, because I don't think -- I hope Mr. Feaman is not misleading the Court. On two occasions so far he said that he represents a creditor of the estate, that's incorrect.

THE COURT: William Stansbury.
MR. MORRISSEY: Correct. William
Stansbury is not a creditor of the estate. He's someone who filed a claim in the estate. An objection was filed by the personal representative, or counsel for the personal representative, which means that Mr. Stansbury had 30 days to run off and file his lawsuit which he's done. He's not done anything with that separate civil litigation. It's not been reduced to a judgment. He is not a creditor, therefore, Judge, he does not have standing not only with respect to the validity of the documents but with respect to anything else in these various litigations.

THE COURT: That's not helping me figure out how much time $I$ need to set aside for this
trial.
MR. MORRISSEY: I'm sorry.
THE COURT: When I'm telling you I'm a simple guy I'm not being modest. I'm just being truthful. That's where I'm at. I'm going to write down what $I$ do next when $I$ leave this room. What $I$ do next when $I$ leave this room is tell my judicial assistant to reserve a day, set this trial date, send you notices. Bang. That thing is done. So that's why $I$ want to stick with this. Do you have any objection to that?

MR. MORRISSEY: NO.
THE COURT: Okay. Great. This is the way I intend to proceed -- I love Marty Colin. This guy is a judge that's been around a long time. I know him. He's an entirely different guy than me. I expect that your experience with Judge Colin has been different than sitting here with me. Am I right? I never appeared in front of him as a judge - I never appeared in front of him while he's a judge and while $I$ was a lawyer. He appeared in front of me while he was a lawyer and $I$ was a judge. I don't know how he is as a judge but $I$ am pretty
sure he's a different guy than me. Nice guy. I like him. But we're different judges. Your experiences with Judge Colin, put them aside. You're having an experience with me now. We have to do it the way $I$ do it or else I'll mess up.

The second thing $I$ have on my list of things to ask you about that I've been jotting down here is this request for guardian ad litem. $I$ think $I$ remember asking and being told that no one has filed a formal request for appointment of a guardian ad litem; is that correct?

MR. O'CONNELL: Correct.
MR. ROSE: In these four cases no one has done that yet.

THE COURT: Okay. Am I going to?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I believe they have, actually.

THE COURT: When was it filed? What docket entry?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know. It was denied a long time ago by Tescher and Spallina, the guys that were removed for fraud in the court. They tried to put guardians on

THE COURT: No, no, no. You see I don't want all the other baggage. I just want the answer to that question. When was it filed?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know. At the beginning.

THE COURT: At the beginning. That takes me to the bottom. That slows down progress on our case management conference. I will go through it. What was the title of the pleading?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I don't know. I don't think Joy's records went back that far.

MS. FOGLIETTA: We pulled things that were pending, Judge. I don't have that.

MR. MORRISSEY: On behalf of the four adult grandchildren it's our intention to file one. We were hoping to file one before today's hearing.

THE COURT: Okay. Since that hasn't been filed then $I$ 'm not taking action on it. That's my practice. If there's something filed I'll move towards getting it resolved. If it's not been filed and it's just in somebody's mind $I$ find that it's difficult to take any action.

I'm crossing that off my list.
There's a pending motion to appoint attorneys -- an attorney for the children. Is that an attorney ad litem?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: An attorney for my children.

THE COURT: Who filed that motion? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Me.

THE COURT: When did you file? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Just to pay the fees for counsel for my children. THE COURT: When did you file it is what I'm trying to figure it out. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: A while ago. THE COURT: Any closer estimate than that? MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: I've been filing that since the first petition in this case in May of 2013 which still isn't heard. THE COURT: May of 2013 is when you filed it?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yeah. MR. O'CONNELL: We think we found one August 28, 2014 in the Simon Bernstein estate. THE COURT: The Simon Bernstein estate is the only one $I$ got up on the computer. The
only thing that happened on August 20 th is an order by Judge Colin maybe.

MR. O'CONNELL: 28th, sorry, Your Honor, 2-8.

THE COURT: Okay. I just got my trifocals reissued. These are the old ones so an 8 and a 0 look alike. I'm moving my head and trying to focus. Bear with me a second.

I don't see anything anywhere near the 28 th of August of '14. Is that the year, '14? MR. O'CONNELL: Yes. It says, "Motion to compel estates of Simon and Shirley to pay counsel for Eliot and his minor children." MS. FOGLIETTA: That's in case number -THE COURT: Well, I don't see any motion with that description. Perhaps the Court doesn't have it scanned in or something. Who knows. Anybody have a paper copy of it that I can look at?

MS. FOGLIETTA: I do.
THE COURT: I wouldn't mind looking at a paper copy if you got one handy. MR. O'CONNELL: Sure. THE COURT: And was there a ruling on this motion for having the estate pay for attorneys
for Eliot and his minor children? Has there been an order on this?

MR. O'CONNELL: Not that I'm aware of, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Was there ever a hearing? MR. ROSE: I don't believe it was set for hearing. That was alluded to that

Mr. Bernstein had requested an attorney for his children and I would suggest that -- subject to -- I don't think there was an objection from anyone -- it's not appropriate to appoint an attorney for his children. If you appoint a guardian ad litem to represent his children then the guardian ad litem has the power to go out and retain counsel and to accomplish the relief that's sought. We don't believe it's appropriate though for Mr. Bernstein himself, but certainly his children who are beneficiaries should have --

THE COURT: All right. It looks like this motion just asks for money. It's not asking for the appointment of counsel. Mr. Eliot is seeking the issuance of money from the trust for the estate. He alludes to the children needing an attorney but he doesn't ask for one to be appointed. He asks if he can be given money.

There's an order $I$ see, Docket Entry 24, where Judge Colin prohibits any new filings. I've not read the order yet but $I$ see the title of the order takes up 20 lines of docket entry here in our computer program. I hope the order is shorter than the title.

MR. O'CONNELL: We got it for Your Honor. (Handing)

THE COURT: Now are these copies ones I should return to you all or can $I$ keep these? MS. FOGLIETTA: You can keep them.

THE COURT: Thanks. Judge Colin had a case management conference. It's a case management order. How about that. It's a great order. He must have been having problems with the progress of this case to issue an order like that. That was at Docket Entry Number 24 which leads me to ask this question, perhaps foolishly, and that's the question if this order was entered by Judge Colin in September of 2014 at Docket Entry Number 24 how come we're up to 82 docket entries and other petitions and things and stuff being filed?

Did he disregard the order, because I think it's a great order, or did something else happen that $I$ don't know about that changed the order, or did he retract the order?

MR. O'CONNELL: Let me try to help there. Just so you can get my position in all this, 1 want to explain. I am a successor personal representative in the simon Bernstein estate, so that's my universe in terms of this matter. I got over a year at this point that I've been involved in that capacity. With regard to that particular order the way everyone has interpreted it is it has to do with anyone to institute new litigation, a new adversary matter they would have to go before Judge Colin, because we certainly have filed, on an administrative level, a number of motions of things that needed to happen.

THE COURT: Administrative stuff is allowed to happen.

MR. O'CONNELL: To go to your good question, well, why are there so many items, not that we filed a ton of motions and petitions but certainly, on my behalf, there are definitely some that we have filed.

THE COURT: Docket Entry Number 41 there is a petition to remove Theodore Stuart Bernstein as alleged successor trustee filed by Eliot Bernstein. How did that get filed? Did Judge Colin approved that?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He directed that.
THE COURT: Say that again?
MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: He directed that.
THE COURT: So there was a hearing that he authorized this petition to be filed?

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Yes. And then a new case was started. He ordered a new case to remove $T$ ed and we're in the middle of that. That's one of the cases.

Just to clarify something, I'm still confused, the first part about the hearing you're ordering, that's not --

THE COURT: We're not on that subject. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Are we on Simon's case or Shirley's case? I'm confused by that. THE COURT: I'm confused too. Welcome to my world.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Welcome to mine.
THE COURT: We're going to eliminate some of the confusion by trying some of these things
pled in this case and one of them that's been pled is Count II of the amended petition of Docket Entry 26 that Judge Colin severed out and said is going to be tried separately.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That's in Shirley.
THE COURT: I'm telling you what I'm doing. You asked me what I'm doing, to clarify what I'm doing. I just told you.

MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: Okay.
MR. ROSE: If $I$ can, just briefly with that, what Judge Colin was doing is you can fax him the motion or bring it to his attention THE COURT: He uses fax? Okay. He is a dinosaur.

MR. ROSE: He would give permission that something could be filed or not filed. We had to go through the extra step of sending him in advance, or asking permission if $I$ wanted to file a motion to approve a sale or whatever we had to get his permission in advance.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I find there's no pending motion for appointment of attorneys for the children so I'm striking that off my list.

Now back to the william stansbury claim
regarding the estate of Simon Bernstein. What is the pleading that sets up any claim that needs to be adjudicated in that case that was not already set? It's the one thing that you're not involved in. What about the claim you said that William Stansbury has? MR. FEAMAN: That's a separate action that was filed and is pending before Judge Blanc in the general jurisdiction division. THE COURT: Okay. So Blanc will figure that one out, right? MR. FEAMAN: And the estate is a defendant.

THE COURT: I'm trying to figure out what I have to set. Blanc has that one, right? MR. FEAMAN: Yes, yes, Your Honor. The only thing, with regard to Mr. Stansbury, I believe, is Mr. Stansbury has filed a motion to discharge him from responsibility for funding the estate's participation in some Chicago litigation, and that should be borne by the estate, but that's already set before Your Honor on October 20 th in the special set hearing. THE COURT: When was that set? When did
the document hit the court records when -setting that hearing?

MR. FEAMAN: I'd say ten days ago. It was set for the day after tomorrow and it had to be reset at my request due to a conflict, and then it was set October 20,2015 pursuant to a notice of hearing $I$ believe our office sent out, I believe, ten days ago, approximately. THE COURT: That would be in case number what?

MR. FEAMAN: That would be case Number 124391CP - 12 -- 2012CP4391.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's a different case than I have on the computer screen. Let me get that one up.

MR. FEAMAN: That's the case number that actually brings us here today pursuant to notice of hearing filed by Mr. O'Connell, the personal representative of the estate.

THE COURT: Just a second. I've been looking at, apparently, the trust case, 14CP3698.

MS. FOGLIETTA: Judge, that's the Shirley trust.

THE COURT: Did you ever see Colin use a
computer in court?
MR. O'CONNELL: Not really.
THE COURT: That's why $I$ call him a
dinosaur. I'd say it to his face trying to get him to be more tech savvy.

I'm scrolling, okay. You see me scrolling with my finger. I've scrolled through all the attorneys. This is more like it. We're up to 386, and roughly ten days ago there was some sort of hearing set. A re-notice of hearing. MR. ELIOT BERNSTEIN: That was an objection to an accounting that $I$ filed timely. THE COURT: The notice of hearing, Mr. Feaman, that you scheduled, or you sent out that I'm referring to is called the fifth re-notice of hearing and it sets hearing on the motion of creditor William Stansbury for a hearing on October 20.

MR. FEAMAN: Yes, Your Honor.
THE COURT: You set aside a 15 -minute period of time for that. Judge Blanc has got the litigation that you referred to in his court and he'll figure that out. MR. FEAMAN: Correct. THE COURT: All right.

MR. FEAMAN: But there's also, with regard, if $I$ may, Your Honor, to Mr. Stansbury's claim, Mr. O'Connell has also filed a motion to enter and approve a settlement agreement between the estate and Mr. Stansbury which is still out there. But related to that is a motion by Mr. O'Connell filed on 7-20-2015 to have Simon Bernstein declared the beneficiary of the JP Morgan IRA account, and the reason it relates to Mr. Stansbury is because the settlement money contemplated to be paid to Mr. Stansbury would come out of that account and there's a question whether that is actually money that should be part of the estate or not so before we actually wanted to fund the settlement we wanted to - I don't mean to speak for Mr. O'Connell -- we wanted to make sure that that would be appropriate source of funds to fund the settlement so there would be no clawback claims either against Mr. Stansbury or the estate subsequent to the consummation of the settlement.

```
    THE COURT: Is that petition at issue?
    MR. FEAMAN: It -- Mr. O'Connell?
```

MR. O'CONNELL: I don't think it was filed as an adversary matter. It's a free-standing petition.

THE COURT: Okay.
MR. O'CONNELL: Everybody has been served with it.

MR. ROSE: For the record we have no objection to that motion being granted. I don't know if anybody objects to the motion. That's certainly something that should be heard if it's objected to very early.

THE COURT: Unless somebody notices it up for hearing, get ready for that.

We've used up all the time $I$ set aside for the Bernstein case. It would sure be nice to spend the rest of my career talking to you about this but $I$ have other people scheduled at 10:30 and $I$ must see them now. Thanks a lot. I'll do my work on setting the trial on the one thing we got and we'll see what happens next.

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you.
THE COURT: It was fun and look forward to a long list of hearings as well. (Whereupon, the hearing is concluded at 10:32 a.m.)
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